DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 054 799 52 LI 003 074

AUTHOR Bundy, Mary Lee; And Others

TITLE The Administrator of a Special Library or Information Center and His Situation. Final Report

INSTITUTION Maryland Univ., College Park. School of Library and Information Services.

SPONS AGENCY Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Research.

BUREAU NO BR-7-1084

PUB DATE Sep 70

CONTRACT OEC-1-7-071084-5017

NOTE 126p.; (1 Reference)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$6.58

DESCRIPTORS *Administration; *Administrator Role; Information Centers; *Innovation; *Librarians; Library Surveys; Public Libraries; Questionnaires; School Libraries; *Special Libraries; University Libraries

ABSTRACT

In the study of the special library and information center administrator, a sample of 150 special libraries and information centers reporting staffs of ten people or more was selected. Ninety-five respondents completed and returned the questionnaires. Full details of sample choice and design and an analysis of the returns are contained in the Appendixes. With regard to the special library it was concluded that instead of the concentration on physical plant and collection development so evident in the other library situations, change phenomena in the special library involved the new technology including client-oriented computer applications, advances in the use of micro-reproduction, and participation in sophisticated network designs. There was a greater propensity to focus upon client requirements and satisfactions as the basic measure of the library contribution. And yet, this administrative class presents no model of active, impatient leadership committed to a reconstitution of library and information services. The evidence of this study revealed no urgency to shift from prevailing practice, to reassess and to reshape the basic philosophy of the field in order to influence change in the nature of the services, in clientele priorities, or in service orientation. (Other parts of this study are available as LI 003071 through LI 003073) (Author/NH)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

BR7-1084
PA 52

ED054799

Final Report

Project No. 07-1084
Contract No. OEC-1-7-071084-5017

THE ADMINISTRATOR OF A SPECIAL LIBRARY OR INFORMATION CENTER AND HIS SITUATION

One Part of the
Executive Study Portion
of
A Program of Research into the Identification of Manpower Requirements, the Educational Preparation and the Utilization of Manpower in the Library and Information Profession

Mary Lee Bundy
Paul Wasserman
with
Jeanne O'Connell, Research Associate

School of Library and Information Services
University of Maryland
College Park, Maryland 20742

September 1970

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a contract with the Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Bureau of Education
Bureau of Research

LI 003 074

Table Of Contents

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	iii
List Of Supplemental Tables	iv
PREFACE	vi
SUMMARY	1
INTRODUCTION	2

PART ONE
THE ADMINISTRATOR AS CHANGE AGENT

Background	6
Education	7
Work Experience	10
Professional Orientation and Activity	11
Career Choice and Career Satisfaction	15
Role Expectations	18
Job Satisfactions	19
Job Dissatisfactions and Frustrations	19
Present Mobility	20
Change Attitudes	22
The Need For Change	22
Satisfaction With The Status Quo	24
Change Possibilities	29
Passive-Active Orientation	33
Other Issues	35

PART TWO
THE SITUATION OF THE LIBRARY ADMINISTRATOR

The Library's Community	39
The Nature of Special Library and Information Center Service	41
Change in Special Libraries and Information Centers	43
Internal Change Factors	47
Personnel	47
Organizational Relationships	51
Formal Organization For Change	54
External Change Factors	56
External Relationships	56
Client Demands	57
The Library Administrator In His Situation	59
CONCLUSIONS	63
SAMPLE DESIGN AND SAMPLE RETURNS	66
SUPPLEMENTAL TABLES	70
QUESTIONNAIRE	94

List of Tables

Table		Page
1.	Present Age	5
2.	Years In Present Position	6
3.	Father's Occupation	7
4.	Undergraduate Subject Major	7
5.	Nature Of Library Education	8
6.	Library School Attendance	9
7.	Types Of Libraries Worked In	10
8.	Number Of Libraries Worked In (Special and Non-Special)	10
9.	Total Number of Professional Organizations Listed (Library and Non-Library)	11
10.	Nature of Organizational Participation	12
11.	Membership In National Professional Associations (Library and Non-Library)	13
12.	Relative Importance Of Professional Sources	14
13.	Time Of Choice To Become A Librarian Or Information Scientist	15
14.	Reasons For Choice To Become A Librarian Or Information Scientist	16
15.	Response to: "If you were asked in some formal place, such as a passport application, to name your occupation, what would you give?"	17
16.	Time Of Choice To Enter Library Or Information Center Administration	18
17.	Interest In Making A Position Change	20
18.	Desired Position In Five Years	21
19.	Type Of Institution Served	39
20.	Type Of Library Subject Matter	40
21.	Types Of Specialized Materials Offered	41
22.	Reference Services	42
23.	Types of Automation	45
24.	Use Of Computerization	45
25.	Plans For Future Automation	46
26.	Advantages Of Interlibrary Cooperation	47
27.	Proportion Of Male Professionals	48
28.	Proportion Of Staff Who Have Been With The Library Or Information Center More Than Ten Years	48
29.	Distribution Of Subject Master's Degrees	49
30.	Type Of Program	50
31.	Decision Making Practices	52
32.	Conflict In Libraries	52
33.	Staff Attitudes Toward Change	53
34.	Types Of Information Regularly Collected And Analyzed	54
35.	Decision Making Relationships Between Library And Management	57

Table

Page

36. Respondent's Perception Of External Demands On His Facility 58
37. Administrator's Satisfaction With Rate Of Change In His Library 59
38. Respondents' Evaluation Of Suggested Change Strategies .. 62

List Of Tables For Sample Design And Returns

39. Comparison Of Universe And Final Returns By Size Of Staff Complements 68
40. Comparison Of Universe And Final Returns By Type Of Library Subject Matter 68
41. Comparison Of Universe And Final Returns By Type Of Organization 68
42. Comparison Of Universe And Final Returns By Sex 69
43. Comparison Of Universe And Final Returns By Census Region 69

List Of Supplemental Tables

Background And Career Of Administrators Of Special Libraries Or Information Centers

44. Sex 70
45. Marital Status 70
46. Occupation Of Wife 70
47. Wife Working At Present Time 71
48. Place Of Birth 71
49. Place Most High School Years Spent 72
50. Father's Occupation: Professional, Technical, And Kindred Workers Only 72
51. Father's Occupat on: Managers, Officials (Except Farm) Only 73
52. Father's Education 73
53. Mother's Education 73
54. Control Of Institution From Which First College Degree Was Received 74
55. Type Of Institution From Which First College Degree Was Received 74
56. Proximity Of First College Degree Institution To Place Of High School Years 74
57. Year First College Degree Was Received 75
58. Response to: "Do you have formal education in library science?"..... 75
59. Year Formal Library Education Was Completed 76
60. Response to: "Do you have formal education beyond the bachelor's in another field?" 76

Table

Page

61. Response to: "What type of librarian or information person did you expect to be originally?" 77
62. Response to: "If you attended a formal program in librarianship or information science, did your interests change in any way during your education?"..... 77
63. Response to: "Have you ever seriously considered getting out of library or information center administration altogether?" 78
64. Response to: "If you could do things over, do you think you would choose library or information center work again?" 78

Professional And Administrative Issues

65. Response to: "This part consists of statements which have been made in the library literature and elsewhere. Please give us your general reaction to them by indicating whether you tend to agree or disagree."..... 79-81
66. Major Changes In Respondents' Libraries From 1965 to 1969 82

Institutional Data

67. Location Of Institution 83
68. Proximity Of Institution To Place Respondent Spent High School Years 83
69. Response to: "Does your library or information center have a general announcing service (such as an acquisitions bulletin)?" 84
70. Response to: "Do you have an individualized announcing service, such as S.D.I.?" 84
71. Response to: "Do you have branches or separately administered collections?" 84
72. Response to: "Do any of your staff have a master's degree in a subject field?" 85
73. Response to: "Are there arrangements for leaves of absence for study purposes for your staff members?" .. 85
74. Response to: "If yes, (there are arrangements for leaves of absence for study purposes) is there partial or full financial support from your organization?" 85
75. Response to: "How many staff members have taken advantage of such opportunity (arrangements for leaves of absence for study purposes) in the last three years?"..... 86
76. Response to: "To whom do you report?" 86
77. Response to: "Is there a library committee?" 86
78. Response to: "If yes, how is it (library committee) selected?" 87

Table

Page

79. Response to: "Is your library or information center a member or participant in any regional or national cooperative library programs? (Include such programs as MARC, receipt of magnetic tapes from governmental agencies, societies, etc.)" 87

80. Respondents' Report Of Regional Or National Cooperative Programs In Which Their Libraries Or Information Centers Are Members 87

81. Response to: "Is this (description of decision making situation) the way you prefer it to be?" 88

82. Response to: "In view of your situation, do you find these demands:" 88

83. Comparison Of Respondents With Formal Library Education To Respondents Without Formal Library Education 89

84. Comparison Of Respondent Members Of American Society For Information Science To Non-Members 90

85. Comparison Of Respondent Members Of American Library Association to Non-Members 91

86. Comparison Of Responses To: "If you were asked in some formal place, such as in a passport application to name your occupation, what would you give?" 92

87. Comparison Of Respondents In Governmental, Industrial, And "Other" Special Libraries And Information Centers 93

PREFACE

This report has its antecedents deeper in the past than the time of the present study. It grows out of work in which the two principal investigators were interested when both were at other universities and engaged in pursuits different from their present responsibilities. That was almost a decade ago. It was a time when considerable research attention was being focused upon the comparative characteristics of the administrative class in a number of professions. It seemed then that to improve librarianship's capacity to understand more clearly the nature of its administrative class, it would be advantageous to collect statistical data which would reveal the characteristics of those who then were playing leadership roles in librarianship and to compare them with their counterparts in other disciplines. What seemed important then was to obtain a clear picture of library administrators, for that was a time when the library organization and the practice of its administrators were not yet perceived in the context of a changing panorama of institutional strivings and organizational dynamics.

Because resources for intellectual exploration in librarianship were more difficult of access than they have since become, the earlier study design remained a proposal; work was held in abeyance on this project for a period of years until the summer of 1967 when the University of Maryland assumed responsibility for the conduct of a broad-scale study of manpower concerns in the profession. What had changed during the elapsed time interval was the perspective of the investigators, not only of the structure of librarianship, but of its need for a fundamental reorientation. Under these terms a profile of the characteristics of library leadership was seen to be neither germane nor of serious interest unless the administrators could be understood in the framework of their responsiveness to adapting the commitments of their organizations in an institutional culture widely characterized by a striving for variation, adaptation, and innovative advance.

It was against such a backdrop that the present research was designed. This study was an attempt to understand and if possible to explain the nature of the senior administrator in libraries of the major types. In order to do so, a melange of factors including personal history and attitudes, administrator perception of basic administrative and professional issues, the record of adaptation in their individual organizations, and the nature of their organizations' characteristics were all seen as elements relating to change propensity or disposition. For the motif of change is the cutting edge of the present analysis, and it is this issue which underlies the rationale and the strategy for the research enterprise which is detailed hereafter.

The investigators are greatly indebted to Mr. Herbert S. White, Vice President for Operations, Institute for Scientific Information, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, who assisted at the questionnaire design, sample construction, and data analysis stages in this portion of the study effort.

SUMMARY

The purpose of the present study was to analyze the characteristics of administrators and of the organizations and the environments in which they function in an attempt to increase understanding of the human and organizational variables which tend to spawn or to inhibit change. The main target of the research is the administrator, since by virtue of the potential inherent in his leadership role, his capacity to catalyze or repel adaptation and variation is seen as a powerful influence upon institutional efforts in librarianship to be adaptive and innovative.

The instrument employed in the analysis was a mail questionnaire addressed to administrators of the four discrete types of libraries: public library, academic library, special library, and school library. The sample included only the chief administrator in organizations of each type, but the size of the organizations included was biased so as to include only the larger and more complex organizations of each type. In the present study of the special library and information center administrator, a sample of 150 libraries was selected at random from a universe of 427 special libraries and information centers reporting staffs of ten people or more. Of this sample 95 respondents completed and returned the questionnaires for a response rate of 64%. Full details of sample choice and design and an analysis of the returns are contained in the Appendixes of this report.

Because the study sought to extend beyond simply accumulating descriptive details on human beings and institutions, issues reflective of propensities to adapt or to innovate were tested through a range of questions relating to background data on education, career, and professional activities of the administrators, to their views of administrative and professional issues, to factual evidence of their libraries' recent experience along a continuum of change, and to institutional characteristics of support, staffing, and environmental factors expected to relate to the capacity of the organizations to be adaptive. A primary concern was to discern where and how and whether change was taking place in the organizations, and insofar as possible, to perceive the degree and the mechanisms by which the librarians who responded to the study instruments provided impetus for such change.

With regard to the special library it was concluded that instead of the concentration on physical plant and collection development so evident in the other library situations, change phenomena in the special library involved the new technology including client-oriented computer applications, advances in the use of micro-reproduction, and participation in sophisticated network designs. There was a greater propensity to focus upon client requirements and satisfactions as the basic measure of the library contribution. And yet, this administrative class presents no model of active, impatient leadership committed to a reconstitution of library and information services. The evidence of this study revealed no urgency to shift from prevailing practice, to reassess and to reshape the basic philosophy of the field in order to influence change in the nature of the services, in clientele priorities, or in service orientation.

INTRODUCTION

The strategy of this study sought to perceive the intellectual and psychological attitudes of administrators, their own personal aspirations and value expectations, their disposition with regard to the need for change and their estimate of conditions needed in general as prelude to change, since it is as a consequence of their values and their perceptions that change in their organizations may be significantly impeded or facilitated.

Not only did we attempt to elicit from the administrators their expectations of change progress and of the organizational conditions and constraints relating to such capacity, but also to understand what the rate of change in their organization actually is. We have sought to understand how strongly the administrators see implicit in their role that of fostering and facilitating change. And we have sought to better understand the composition and the characteristics of the administrative class in librarianship in order to more clearly perceive whether such factors as age, educational background, and orientation, length of time in a responsible administrative post, effects of lateral and vertical career movements, have a bearing upon the propensity for library administrators to serve as leaders for change. Because we were concerned with environmental factors as one salient conditioning element in the change process, we have also attempted to determine what kinds of organizational and institutional contexts may be seen as more or less facilitating of the change capacity of the library and of the librarian.

It should be clear that in order to understand the capacity of librarianship to be adaptive, many alternative methods might have been employed. Inherent in the design of this effort has been the hypothesis that a crucial ingredient in the capacity of librarianship to be adaptive relates to the leadership potential of its administrative class. Under these terms it should be clear that what we have dealt with were very subtle and elusive factors, not always easily amenable to precise measure. Moreover, questions have been put to respondents in such a form as to render impossible the kind of personal probing and detailed analysis of issues which might have been possible in the case of a personal interview study.

The decision to use the questionnaire was based on the desire to collect quantifiable and comparable data. The decision to distribute it by mail was made in the interests of time and economy. This form of distribution has the advantage that all respondents are responding to the same stimuli without any possible interviewer bias. The potential disadvantage, bias introduced because of non-respondents, appears to have been overcome.

Questions arise as to how frank respondents are, particularly since their institutions were to be identified by them. Every effort was made not to bias answers by "loaded" questions, nor were areas explored which were deemed to be violating the privacy of an individual or which might put him in a position of presenting information so as to reflect poorly on himself. From prior experience and through preliminary interviews for pretest purposes, the investigators believe respondents answered honestly, and, while space did not always allow a full or in-depth expression of feelings, they believe respondents' expressions represent their attitudes on the issues raised.

While the questionnaire was administered to different administrator audiences, the basic strategy remained comparable with only such adaptation and modification as was needed in order to take into account the differences in the characteristics of the several library organizational forms, the principal issues underlying change commitments of administrators in these variable settings, and details regarding the characteristics of the organizations which these different types of library administrators represented.

The study instrument was divided into four principal parts. The first section treated the background and career characteristics of the respondents. Here the attempt was to collect information so that the administrators could be profiled with regard to their sexual composition, their age, family status, personal career history, educational preparation, work experience in and out of libraries, career choice factors, expectations and aspirations, information about their view of administrative roles and responsibilities, perceptions of personal goals in administration and of library work roles, nature of professional associations, satisfactions and dissatisfactions and real and potential mobility patterns in their personal careers.

The second section of the study questionnaire treated professional and administrative issues with the objective of discerning the change disposition of the respondent. Here the emphasis was upon perceiving the way in which respondents recognized the extent to which librarianship and their libraries were in need of modification and adaptation as a function of their own value orientation. Their views were sought with regard to a whole range of factors across a wide continuum from education for librarianship to the responses of libraries to different constituencies and to the real and potential impact of network and regional arrangements.

The third section of the questionnaire sought in its overall design to accumulate information about the actual adaptations and modifications which had been and were being made in the libraries represented by the administrators responding to the questionnaire. Here there was provided an opportunity for each respondent to detail

the specific nature of the change situation in his own organization and to categorize the relative importance of such changes in relation to the satisfaction of the administrator and of the staff with the rate of change and the progress of change in the organization. In addition, the administrator was invited to suggest here where further variation and adaptation might be expected to take place in the organization, what types of modification were actively being furthered and sought as well as the prospects for realizing such aspirations in the future.

The last section of the questionnaire elicited details relating to the characteristics of the libraries included in the sample. Here were included details of size and growth and emphases within the organizations, the nature of particular services, staff organization and structure and arrangements, relationships with governing bodies and constituencies, and of other factors seen as related to the capacity of the organization to be adaptive. The purpose here was to understand the organizational and environmental setting within which the administrator functioned as one factor in the equation relating to the capacity of the administrator to lead the organization in the direction of change.

Considering the dissimilarity of the library situations involved (viz, the historical society and the technical data center) analysis of the special library and information center questionnaire responses posed some particular problems both in the reporting of group data and in comparing it with the other more homogeneous types of libraries surveyed. Taken together, however, these two difficulties appeared to present a strategy for deeper analysis of aspects considered to be of special relevance to the study. Accordingly, where distinct differences from all three other administrative groups emerged here, (a considerably smaller proportion of special library and information center administrators reported formal library education, for instance, than did academic, public, and school respondents) separate analysis was made--special librarians with formal library education were compared to those without--in order to expose other variations in personal characteristics,and, more importantly for the purposes of the present study, to determine whether the change attitudes of the subgroups differed to any significant degree. In addition, administrators within industrial, governmental, and other types of special library settings were compared with each other along the same dimensions.

Some interesting variations as to sex and age composition and educational patterns were found and are detailed in the Supplemental Tables following the report. With the exceptions noted, however (see Change Attitudes, pp. 22-38), across the board none of the subgroups displayed sufficient diversity in their postures toward a range of change issues to qualify materially the data reported in Part One. As will be seen, certain other disparities in response patterns are outlined in Part Two.

PART ONE

THE ADMINISTRATOR AS CHANGE AGENT

In examining the special library and information center administrator in a change context, the analysis of a wide range of personal characteristics and attitudes was assumed to be relevant. It was hypothesized, in fact, that the administrator's posture toward change in the library and information fields might be partially explained by his background and experiences: his social origins, education, career path, and current professional activity. Insight into his change propensity was expected to come too from an exploration of his career aspirations and job satisfactions and dissatisfactions. In addition to this somewhat indirect evidence, one section of the survey directly probed his attitudes on a variety of change related issues. Taken together these findings permit generalizations about the probable influence of this particular administrative group on change in the field during the years ahead.

Given the prevailing assumption of high positive correlation between youth and the promotion of change, it should be noted that only 3% of special library and information center administrators are under 35 years of age. Table 1 shows the age distribution of the respondents.

Table 1

Present Age

	Percent
Under 35	3
35 - 50	38
Over 50	50
No response	10

Of this group 60% are men, approximating the male-female distribution of public library administrators. (In contrast 89% of academic library administrators are men, and 80% of school library supervisors are women.)

With respect to job tenure, it is reasonable to expect that the relative newcomer will be more readily disposed to change than the long-term incumbent. In this connection the distribution of special library and information center administrators would appear to be favorable: fully 57% have been in their present positions only five years or less, while only 26% have served for more than ten years.

Table 2

Years In Present Position

	Percent
Less than one year	10
1 - 5 years	47
6 - 10 years	15
11 - 15 years	17
16 - 20 years	6
21 - 25 years	2
26 years and over	1
No response	2

Background

As Table 3 shows, the highest proportion of special library and information center administrators emerge from the professional and managerial classes with skilled labor and white collar worker backgrounds well represented.*

*For additional data regarding the personal background and characteristics of the administrators and for special analyses of selected aspects, see section "Supplemental Tables" in the Appendixes.

Table 3

Father's Occupation

	Percent
Professional, technical and kindred workers	23
Managers, officials and proprietors (except farm)	22
Craftsmen, foremen and kindred workers	17
Clerical and kindred workers	10
Farmers and farm managers	7
Sales workers	7
Operatives and kindred workers	2
Service workers (except private household)	2
Laborers (except farm and mine)	1
Retired	1
No response	7

Education

Compared to the administrator in other types of libraries reviewed, three times as many of this respondent group received their undergraduate degrees in one of the sciences. Some 60% are university educated, while 24% attended a liberal arts college.

Table 4

Undergraduate Subject Major

	Percent
Humanities (including history)	39
Social Sciences	23
Sciences	20
Applied fields (e.g. business, education, engineering)	12
Library Science	2
No response	4

A total of 42% have continued their education beyond the undergraduate level varying from individual course work to the achievement of formal degrees. Of those pursuing advanced work 40% have focused on one of the humanities, one-third on science or engineering, 16% on the social sciences, and 8% on education. Only a few of the respondents with non-library science Ph.D.'s (24% of those who pursued advanced work) have also had formal library education and one-half of those Ph.D.'s were granted in either science or engineering.

In all, only 61% of special library and information center administrators have had formal library education. As indicated earlier, this represents a sharp variation from academic, public, and school findings with percentages of 94%, 97%, and 90% respectively.

Table 5

Nature Of Library Education

	Percent*
Undergraduate minor in Library Science	9
Fifth year Bachelor's in Library Science	39
Master's Degree in Library Science	52
Ph.D. in Library Science	3
Certificate	2
Other	7

*Base = those reporting library education

Twenty-seven institutions were listed by the respondents as the sources of their library education. As displayed in Table 6 the first four institutions account for almost half of the attendance.*

Table 6

Library School Attendance

	Percent**
Columbia University	15
University of Illinois	14
University of Southern California	10
University of Chicago	7
Western Michigan University	5
Pratt Institute	5
University of Washington	3
Simmons College	3
Rutgers University	3
Syracuse University	3
George Peabody College for Teachers	3
Catholic University of America	2
Drexel Institute of Technology	2
Louisiana State University	2
Rosary College	2
University of Denver	2
University of Kentucky	2
University of Maryland	2
University of Oklahoma	2
University of Texas	2
University of Wisconsin	2
Other schools	10

**Base = those reporting library education

*These figures undoubtedly do not include all library schools attended by special library and information center administrators since attendance was reported by only 61% of this group. A larger sample would most probably reveal other schools.

Work Experience

Some information about the career paths of special library and information center administrators was obtained by broad analyses of both library and non-library working experiences. Of the respondents, 60% reported that their library careers had been limited to work in special libraries, while 40% specified previous employment in at least one other type of library.

Table 7

Types Of Libraries Worked In

	Percent*
Public	74
Academic	58
School	11

*Base = those who have worked in other types of libraries

As shown in Table 8, almost one-third of these administrators have spent their library careers in a single institution and only 15% have moved more than four times.

Table 8

Number Of Libraries Worked In
(Special and Non-Special)

Number	Percent
1	31
2	11
3	21
4	20
5	8
6	4
7	3
Could not be determined	2

With respect to non-library occupational backgrounds, it was found that teaching experience is a less pervasive characteristic of this group than of academic, public, and school library administrators. Indeed, with the exception of 19% who have worked in the broadly defined scientific and technological fields, no significant patterns emerged from the data collected. It was noted that 15% specified that they had no non-library working experience, and 23% reported military service.

Professional Orientation and Activity

Studies of other professional groups suggest that change-oriented members are likely to be the ones who are professionally active outside their immediate situations. Consequently an effort was made to determine how "cosmopolitan" the special library and information center administrator is with respect to his organizational affiliations and participation,as well as to ascertain the nature of his other professional activities. As shown in Table 9, more than 60% of the group are members of at least three professional organizations. They are, however, distinctly less inclined to be organization participants than their academic, public, and school library counterparts.(Comparable figures for academic, public, and school library respondents are 79%, 78%, and 94% respectively.) It would appear likely that this type of activity is less encouraged and rewarded by the institutions served by special library and information center administrators.

Table 9

Total Number Of Professional Organizations Listed (Library and Non-Library)

Number	Percent
1	8
2	25
3	25
4	12
5	15
6	4
7	4
8	1
9 or more	0
No response	5

In an attempt to arrive at some measure of the extent of respondents' participation in the organizations to which they belonged, a number of cumulative points were assigned for membership, attendance at meetings, current committee work, and recent service as an officer.* The results of this rough weighting--again compared to other library administrators--indicate that only a small number of special library and information center respondents are heavily involved in organizational activity, perhaps for the same reason suggested before.

Table 10

Nature Of Organizational Participation

	Percent
Low (0-14 points)	47
Medium (15-27 points)	44
High (28 points or over)	3
No response	5

The national professional affiliation of this group varies distinctively from the other administrative groups. The American Library Association and local library association memberships dominate the affiliation listings of academic and public library administrators, while school library supervisors tend to belong to national and local educational associations as well as to library groups. As Table 11 shows, almost two-thirds of special library and information center administrators are members of the Special Libraries Association (reaching a high of 88% with industry librarians) and a range of other national library associations appear on the list. Small numbers of respondents participate, too, in non-library associations geared to special areas of interest.

*One point was assigned for membership; three points for attendance at meetings; four points for current committee work; five points for service as an officer within the last five years.

Table 11

Membership In National Professional Associations
(Library And Non-Library)

	Percent
Special Libraries Association	62
American Society for Information Science	35
American Library Association	34
American Chemical Society	10
Medical Library Association	7
American Association for the Advancement of Science	6
American Association of Law Libraries	5
National Microfilm Association	5
Society of American Archivists	5
American Management Association	3
National Security Industrial Association	3
American Association for State and Local History	3
No response	5

Other professional activities in which the respondents have engaged include: contributions to the literature (54%); studies or surveys of other libraries (34%); and regional planning efforts (34%). Approximately one-fourth have done some teaching, lecturing, or consulting in the field.

The sources to which administrators turn for professional ideas and stimulation were also examined and respondents were asked to rank a number of likely sources. Confirming again the diversity of orientation within the special library and information center sample, it is interesting to note here that although the literature of their own profession was placed second by academic, public, and school library respondents, it occupies a minor position for this group.

Table 12

Relative Importance of Professional Sources

Source	Rank Order
Meetings of professional information groups	1
Professionals on your staff	2
Special institutes and conferences	3
Other information professionals	4
People outside the information field	5
Professional journals and other literature of librarianship and information science	6
Literature outside librarianship and information science	7

Reflecting the variety of special libraries studied, a range of people outside the information field were cited. Scientists and engineers, management personnel, and computer and systems specialists were mentioned most often. Respondents named scientific and technological materials and management science journals as the non-library literature of greatest importance to them.

Career Choice and Career Satisfaction

While an appreciable number of special library and information center administrators appear to have elected the information field during their school years, for at least half of them this was a choice made at a later point in time.

Table 13

Time of Choice to Become a Librarian or Information Scientist

	Percent
During high school or before	6
As an undergraduate	23
During graduate school	3
While working in a library or a library connected activity	15
While engaged in another career or occupation	43
After military service	1
Other	3
No response	5

Recognition of the importance of the information function was most frequently mentioned as a conditioning factor, although the influence of librarians and a liking for books carried considerable weight. Table 14 shows the distribution of reasons offered for the vocational choice.

Table 14

Reasons for Choice to Become a Librarian or Information Scientist

	Percent
From working in subject discipline I recognized the importance of information handling	31
I was influenced by a librarian I knew	28
I always liked books	26
I had reached a dead end in my technical field and information work opened new avenues	7
As a result of vocational counseling	6
A member of my family was a librarian	5
Other factors (e.g., economic or market considerations, satisfactory working experience in library or information fields)	42
No response	3

In response to a general question, "What type of librarian or information person did you expect to be originally?" a total of 53% referred to the type of library in which they had planned to work, and 30% answered by mentioning a particular kind of work. One-fourth specified an early interest in special libraries, 14% were drawn to public librarianship, and reference and administrative work attracted 11% and 10% respectively. Comparatively few respondents referred to other types of libraries or work roles.

For the 61% who reported having had formal library education attendance at library school appears to have had a negligible effect on career choice; 83% indicated that their interests were not changed in any way during library education.

If they could "do things over," three-fourths of this administrative group would choose library or information center work again, and--as revealed by a question summarized in Table 15--three-fourths tend to identify themselves as members of the library or information profession (with some variety of designation). Consistent with their academic, public, and school library counterparts, few respondents characterized themselves primarily as part of an administrative class.

Table 15

Response to: "If you were asked in some formal place, such as a passport application, to name your occupation, what would you give?"

	Percent
Librarian	66
Library director, library administrator	4
Director, administrator	5
Information scientist, technical information officer	9
Scientist, engineer	7
Archivist	3
Other	4
No response	1

The lack of fundamental orientation toward administration suggested in the preceding table may be partly explained by answers to the question: "At what point did you decide to go into library or information center administration?" Apparently, as shown in Table 16, close to one-half of the respondents entered the managerial ranks as the result of "circumstance" rather than by deliberate pre-selection of this role.

Table 16

Time Of Choice To Enter
Library Or Information Center Administration

	Percent
I never consciously decided. It just happened	48
From the beginning	21
After some time as a librarian or information worker	18
During library school	5
Other	4
No response	4

Close to two-thirds have never seriously considered getting out of library or information center administration altogether, but 35% reported that they have been attracted by other possibilities. Of this latter group 23% would go into library school teaching, 19% would go back to professional work, and 19% would start a new career in an information-related field such as technical communication or publishing. Those who would leave library and information work altogether see possibilities in other administrative positions (32%), want to return to the discipline of their subject preparation (26%), or wish to participate in a variety of other business or professional milieux (23%).

Role Expectations

In view of the large proportion of corporation and government libraries represented, it is probably not surprising that a significant number of special library and information center administrators stress the managerial functions of their positions as compared to very small percentages in academic, public, and school libraries. When invited to identify the most important dimensions of their present roles, almost one-third mentioned the necessity for efficient management of resources and/or the improvement of their own administrative skills. For one-fourth of the respondents a dominant concern is the recruitment, training, and supervision of staff (a concern displayed by somewhat larger percentages of academic library respondents). General program development and expansion received frequent mention,and a number

emphasized the need to meet client requests more quickly and effectively through refinements of processing and retrieval techniques. In addition 13% expressed specific interest in computer applications and the automation of appropriate routines--more than twice as many as the number who specified similar interests in other types of libraries.

Job Satisfactions

On the whole, special library and information center administrators appear to find and take more direct satisfaction from service-client interaction than do their peer groups in other types of libraries examined. For a comparatively large number of these respondents, a major source of job satisfaction is the conviction that their efforts are both useful and appreciated and that their library is responding effectively to the information needs of the parent organization or constituent group. Some take particular delight in the introduction of self-styled innovative techniques and programs; others simply report an overall improvement in library operations. Here it is distinctly the service process, rather than the acquisition of holdings (collection building is cited by only one respondent) that seems rewarding. Staff associations and the variety of interchange with other professionals in the larger organization are an additional source of satisfaction for a sizeable number of respondents. The opportunities for learning were cited by a few. A small number indicated that they specifically enjoy their leadership roles or their sense of personal contribution to a worthwhile enterprise.

Job Dissatisfactions And Frustrations

Duplicating academic, public, and school library findings, the largest proportion of special library and information center respondents report that they find financial and personnel constraints their major sources of job dissatisfaction. Over one-half of this group refer to the difficulties of maintaining a high level of service with limited funds or with a paucity of qualified staff members. In addition, one-fourth report that management of the client group is insufficiently attuned to the information function, slow to exploit its potential, or, on the other hand, unrealistic in its level of expectation. Smaller numbers deplore the lack of adequate communication or proliferation of red tape inherent in some bureaucratic structures. Lack of space was cited by a few respondents as a source of continuing frustration and a few find the pressures on their time burdensome.

Present Mobility

In the effort to introduce organizational change,an individual who is prepared to leave if his conditions are not met has a probable advantage over the one who is not. Similarly, if extraprofessional considerations tend to dominate his career decisions, challenging new opportunities may have to go by the board. Responses to the question: "Which of the following best describes how you feel about making a job change in the near future?" suggest that special library and information center respondents are a somewhat more mobile group than the administrators in other types of libraries, but that one-third of them are fairly firmly entrenched in their present positions.

Table 17

Interest In Making A Position Change

	Percent
While I am not actively seeking a change, I am interested in openings which occur and would certainly be prepared to change	45
I am pretty well settled where I am. I do not anticipate a change	37
I have only recently taken this position and therefore do not anticipate a move in the near future	12
I am actively interested in making a job change	3
No response	3

What factors enter into a decision to stay or to move? Of the two-thirds of the respondents who would be willing to consider another position, slightly better than half of them cite salary as an important condition. New challenges or additional responsibilities were specified as major considerations by approximately one-third, while an organizational climate favoring independence of operation received some mention. A small number feel that management's attitude toward the information facility is paramount (particularly with respect to the use of new technology) and a few would be influenced by the

reputation of the parent organization. The geographic location of the new position was the only non-job-connected element mentioned by a significant proportion (one-fourth) of this group.

Respondents who would choose to remain in their current positions are about equally divided between those who weight personal factors highly and those for whom professional considerations are dominant. A fair proportion report that there is sufficient challenge or potential for growth and change where they are; others value the prestige of the institution in which they play a part; still others simply like their jobs. By far the largest number who cite personal reasons for the decision to stay report that they are close to retirement or that their length of service would make it economically disadvantageous to move at this point. Other factors mentioned included various family commitments or a distinct preference for the area.

Abstracting from the conditions which might impel a move, it is of interest that only 29% of special library and information center respondents would positively hope to be in another position in the relatively near future. Answers to the question "Ideally, what would you like to be doing five years from now?" produced the following distribution.

Table 18

Desired Position In Five Years

	Percent
In the Same Position	43
Same	24
Same, wit better library support facilities	13
Same, with better personal benefits	6
In Another Position	29
Other library position	14
In library-allied field, such as teaching library science or consulting	10
In non-library field	5
Retired	19
Don't Know	3
No response	6

Change Attitudes

The change orientation of administrators was probed directly through a series of both closed and open ended questions. The broad dimensions explored included his receptivity generally to change in the profession and his satisfaction or lack of satisfaction with the status quo of the field. His attitude toward specific change possibilities was also solicited--information retrieval, information networks, use of the computer, microstorage. Questions here and in other parts of the questionnaire examined the degree to which the administrator is committed to traditional library aspects compared with newer forms of service, whether he has a book or broader information or media orientation, and whether his notion of service is of an active or passive character. Finally, for the special library group, several issues related particularly to special library development were raised for comment. These included the relationship of the library to the information center, the types of preparation needed for special library and information service work, and the optimum placement of the library and information center within the administrative structure of the larger organization.

THE NEED FOR CHANGE. While 31% did not respond to the statement, "Those advocating change in the profession are frequently more concerned with their own advancement than with helping the profession," the largest percentage who took a position, 48%, disagreed. Two-thirds agree that "Those coming into the profession ought to be prepared to learn before they suggest changes." Opinion was divided as to whether "Libraries have simply failed to respond to changing times and changing needs." While 38% agreed, 42% disagreed. Twice as many disagreed as agreed with the statement, "While it is true libraries need to change, change is well underway and will come about naturally," and 76% agreed that "If special libraries don't get with it, others within the organization they serve will come along to do their job." On this group of questions, special library and information center administrators displayed a generally higher concern about the need for change than did their counterparts in other library settings. The greatest disparity emerged between special and academic library administrators, with 65% of the latter group disagreeing that "Libraries have simply failed to respond to changing times and changing needs," and only slightly better than one-half in agreement that "If academic libraries don't 'get with it,' other agencies will come along to do their job."

In response to "Charges have been made that by and large the special library and information center is failing to meet the needs of its user community. Please give us your estimate," respondents were about evenly divided in their opinions. A number of them dealt with

issues tangential to the main question, but almost an equal number expressed strong dissatisfaction and disbelief in the statement. Representative of those who disagreed were the following:

> I believe special libraries are many jumps ahead of other libraries in this regard. In general those I know about are good; maybe the poor ones aren't really special libraries.

> I disagree with this opinion. Not only have libraries and information service centers improved in techniques in the past two decades, but a greater and more varied type of service is being offered. We have gone a long way.

For those who agreed with the statement, such agreement was reflective of the fact that the special library, and this typically referred to libraries other than their own, was simply not keeping pace:

> By and large this could be true as evidenced by the growth in information analysis centers.

> Probably this is true. Collections and services are all too often extremely limited and personnel are simply not effective.

While some respondents equivocated on the question, there seemed to be something of a pattern among those who felt that if there were limitations, they were not limitations of the library or of library personnel,but rather of the organization within which the library functions. Some of these explanations follow:

> If this is true, it is for the basic reason in my opinion that the company has failed. The organization has simply not formulated a policy for the library or information center which provides adequate guidelines for the areas of service, its growth potential, and its identity within the organizational hierarchy.

> Most special libraries,within the resources given them, do a creditable job. No library or information center is entirely satisfied with the service it gives, but greater skill and/or resources are needed to do the job.

For a number of respondents,the question could not be answered except in the context of a particular library. That is, many of them felt that although there were special libraries which fit this description, others were performing at a higher level.

SATISFACTION WITH THE STATUS QUO. "Agree-Disagree" questions also explored the measure of satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the status quo of the field. Three-fourths agreed that "Despite other factors advancement in most libraries still depends largely on ability." One-half disagreed that "Getting ahead in this profession depends on knowing the right people," while 25% agreed. Overwhelmingly they disagreed, and 37% strongly disagreed, with the statement, "There is probably not much the average library or information administrator can do to effect change much one way or another." Yet incongruously, three-fourths agreed with "Little can be done to effect major change in libraries until those who control the funds are educated as to the value of the library." They tended to agree that "The leadership in this profession is by and large conservative and largely concerned with protecting the status quo." While 44% agreed, 29% disagreed with the statement. Agreement was reported by 62%, while only 21% disagreed with "Librarians in general are far too timid and passive." Further, 57% agreed that "Librarians have accepted low salaries for too long," while 12% disagreed.

In answering the question "Library schools have come in for criticism regarding whether they are meeting the real needs and problems of the field. What is your assessment?" the respondents overwhelmingly felt that library schools were not adequately meeting their responsibilities. A chronic lament related to the fact that library schools are preparing students for other forms of librarianship rather than for special librarianship. The following quotation illustrates the point:

> Library schools are really training only public library types, with a few bows toward fringe librarians, They must steadily broaden their curricula.

The concern with the theoretical versus pragmatic orientation was strongly reflected among the respondents with a number identifying the fact that the capacity of graduates to perform is decidedly limited. The ideology of the schools, which is shared with their students, also came in for criticism as indicated in the following remarks:

> It seems that many of the schools are sending out rather inept administrators. These individuals are in many instances too often trying to keep up a professional image rather than getting the job done.

Another important issue upon which respondents expounded concerned the limits of library education with regard to the subject expertise required in the special library setting. As some of the respondents suggested, this is a very serious issue in the special library:

> Library schools in general have not the vaguest idea of the information needs of the typical engineer and how best to prepare individuals to serve these needs.
>
> They are two decades behind the demands of current scientific research with little inclination to be aggressive in changing their orientation.

A number of the comments and criticisms were exceedingly caustic and indicative of the fact that practitioners in the special library have little tolerance for the product of library education:

> I am anti-library school. They teach details which can be learned by a bright teen-ager in a few months.
>
> It seems to be a unanimous or near unanimous opinion of library school graduates and students that the program is an utter bore. I believe strong subject emphasis should be placed on subject fields and research and a supplementary separate program in library intraining technique courses could be given.
>
> Most library schools are behind the times. They teach Dewey when Library of Congress is mostly used, they talk about more charging systems when computers are taking over. In short they are still in the nineteenth century.

A small number of respondents had no point of view on this question and felt they were unqualified to comment. Another small group were either supportive of the present state of library education or thought it was of variable quality.

> Depends on the school. UCLA, USC, and Stanford are with it. Most eastern schools are still too traditional.
>
> Which and or what fields? No library school can train a librarian in a specialized subject field They can train him in the methods of making the collection available for use--cataloging--but not in the specialized printed matter. This is not the fault of the school, but is due to rapidly increasing subject specialities.

Essentially the pragmatic bias of the special librarian came through in the overall range of the responses; perhaps the comments of this

group are best summarized in the following quotation:

> Ten percent of what is taught is valuable. The other ninety percent could be taught better in-house, providing the person has a subject speciality.

The responses to the question "In recent months there has been open criticism of the leadership role of the professional associations. Please give us any comments you care to make on this issue, including your views on whether present associations represent your needs and interests," revealed the variability of the special library community. A number of respondents had no opinion, reflective of the fact that they were either not actively involved in the organizations' affairs or simply not members of any of the major national bodies. For some respondents the role and contribution of the associations were not at all disappointing. As the following respondents put it:

> I think they do pretty well. I tend to be conservative and feel that a national organization has responsibility to put a brake on headlong charges into the future.

> I am not sure what the criticism refers to, but in my experience I have found that the professional associations take an active and competent leadership role. The present associations meet my needs and interests quite adequately.

Another group, however, bewailed the large number of organizations extant, and sentiment was sporadically expressed for greater concentration in one place.

> S.L.A. serves no useful purpose, should be absorbed by A.S.I.S.

> There are too many organizations! Let S.L.A. and A.S.I.S. join forces for instance, as is contemplated.

But for some there was serious question about the utility and overall contribution of the national associations:

> The criticism is justifed. The associations should take more positive action to stabilize salaries at levels that meet competition from other professions and to require libraries to pay them. The associations need to recruit vigorously, a better salary structure would aid in recruitment.

> They tend to be conservative. They are oriented to their own concerns and interests and they simply reinforce this. They are not information-oriented.

> No group operates on any higher level than its most advanced members. To seek an overextension of this organization role is foolish. As a profession matures and finds itself with the changes taking place now, so will the professional associations. Because of the numbers involved, organizations lag to some extent; it is each member's responsibility to help bring about the leadership.

Those who were familiar with the American Library Association saw it as largely out of touch or valueless for their purposes:

> The American Library Association is so big and sprawling that I can't keep track of all their activities.

> A.L.A. is a bureaucratic monster! Who don't they do something important such as accredit libraries, impose sanctions, etc.? I almost agree with the person who said that A.L.A. should be abolished and started all over again.

The variability of the responses is in some measure a function of the fact that different respondents were talking about different organizations. The criticisms which are directed at A.L.A. might not be germane to S.L.A. or A.S.I.S. for the same respondent,if in fact he were familiar with those organizations and their programs and purposes. For the special library interests it may also be the case that national societies can only be supported up to a point in an organizational culture which is not that sensitive to external pressures unless they are imposed in such a way that the organization cannot bypass them. Thus a company or a government department can be less concerned about the effects and the ideology of the professional society than could,for example,a public library or an academic library:

> Since we are a highly specialized research library, we find little of interest or importance in most association programs.

Still, it was an uncommon respondent,such as the following,who had given up all hope:

> I have discontinued belonging to any professional associations.

Respondents were also spread across a wide continuum in their replies to "Some people we have talked to feel that something needs to be done to change the types of people being attracted into librarianship. What is your assessment?" About one-fifth felt that the people drawn to the field were being upgraded gradually:

> We're attracting some fine young people, but we need to do more faster.
>
> Recent library school graduates whom I have interviewed in the past few years all seem alert, personable, young men and women.
>
> Change is already evident. It is hoped that more dynamic individuals arrive on the scene at a fast rate.

But a far larger proportion of the respondents felt that the statement was true and identified a range of characteristics which should be sought among those being recruited to librarianship.

> Libraries are used by people and librarians should be people oriented. They should love the intellectual quest and be eager to participate with the library users in their quest for literature to meet their needs. Extroverts not introverts should be attracted.
>
> I don't like the idea of "Let's get more men into librarianship." I have met some pretty poor specimens. Our field is wide and needs people and the needs for people are versatile. We should recruit minds, personalities, abilities.
>
> Librarians must be more aggressive and more alert to business functions. They must get out of the completely scholarly area and completely service area to a combination of both, or a separation for greater specialization.

There was a decided strain among the respondents, even though the numbers were not high, of those who felt that the key issue was subject sophistication:

> How best to satisfy the needs of the user than being a user yourself? That is, engineers, physicists, chemists, must be attracted into the field of information science.

> I would suggest that more scientists and engineers be drawn into the field; but here we go, can most companies or will most organizations pay the equivalent to information people as they pay to those classified as scientist or engineer?

For some respondents, albeit again a small proportion, the essential problem lies in the image of librarianship which attracts the people normally found in libraries. This perspective is summed up in the following remarks:

> The information science programs have improved the caliber of students. The library science programs will continue to attract little old ladies who like books.

CHANGE POSSIBILITIES. Almost two-thirds disagreed with the statement, "The computer offers some but no major advantages for the special library and information center." On this particular issue a noticeable variation emerged in response patterns within the special library and information center administrative group. While only one-half of those respondents with formal library education foresee major advantages in computer application, a high 81% of those with other educational backgrounds predicted potential computer contributions. Since further analysis reveals that only 44% of the administrators within company libraries have formal library education, as opposed to approximately three-fourths in governmental and other library settings, it would appear that a computer orientation is most pronounced in the industrial library.

Two-thirds of the entire group agreed that "Major improvements in local library and information service can be expected from increased interlibrary cooperation," and 87% agreed that "A technician level is needed in libraries and information centers to relieve the time of the professional." Opinion was divided on several other issues. There was agreement among 46% that "We must look increasingly to federal support to make major improvements in information science and technology," but 35% disagreed. While 46% agreed that "Space problems in special libraries and information centers will only be solved by greater use of microstorage devices," 29% disagreed. Similarly 58% disagreed with the statement, "The technology of data processing and microreprography is not yet sufficiently developed to warrant widespread implementation in libraries and information centers," while only 28% agreed. On the question of microstorage, again, the respondent without formal library education--typically the company library administrator--was inclined to be most favorably disposed toward its usage.

A substantial variability of responses to the question "There are many who believe that the information revolution (the introduction of computerized storage and retrieval of information) is going to have a radical impact on the special library and information center. What do you foresee will come about?" was observed. A fair number of respondents expressed no opinion and preferred not to make any such forecast. A number of respondents predicted that there would be great advances in network arrangements with the capacity for libraries to draw from intelligence at a distant point. The following remarks suggest the line of some of the responses:

> Network of centers, each with specialized collections with all resources available through communication lines from any center.
>
> A tendency toward centralized collections and processing with remote access wherever need exists.
>
> I foresee that libraries will be linked together in national networks and anyone will be able to secure information wherever he is no matter where the information is. This will be possible for systems of information retrieval and rapid methods of transmission.

The number of respondents who identified the fact that microforms would be used far more widely in the future was a relatively high one as reflected in comments such as the following:

> There will be an increasing use of microforms for storage of actual documents.
>
> I expect reproduction of books and other materials for microform to be quite common in the future.

Still a considerable number of respondents felt that even if dramatic advances should come to pass, they might not affect or influence the work done in the more limited size and scale special library:

> The only way computerized storage can be sustained physically or financially is by centralization. For our library,questions are too varied and too nonrepetitious to justify computerized expense. It is hard to replace the ability of the brain to sort and evaluate as the search is performed. It has selective powers not able to computerize. For instance, in ten minutes we are able to give a man ten or twelve vital articles zeroed in to his specific problem. We know, just from even using an index what journals do what. This is not the kind of thing computers can ever hope to do as well.

Only a small number of respondents were hostile to such a future. The following response was uncommon:

> Someday there will be more information retrieval but as a library dinosaur, I find it difficult to believe that any machine can be as effective, as flexible, as a knowledgeable, scholarly librarian. I do not believe microfilms are permanent. I doubt that tapes are.

While there were some few who saw the computer as a device for reducing the repetitive detail aspects of librarianship, this was a far more limited number than was true with the academic, public, or school librarians:

> Less drudgery, less routine work for clericals and professionals.

> Relief from many accounting and record duties. An increased speed in meeting special needs based upon access to this equipment.

Study participants were also asked to respond to the following question: "Many people feel the future direction of library and information service lies in the development of regional and national library information networks. How much do you feel such developments should influence the individual program of the special library and information center in the next 5-10 years?" The general tenor of the response was to concede that this might be the case but not to be very excited or enthusiastic about the prospect. For most of the respondents, even those who felt that it would be an important development, there was not the anticipatory zeal that seemed to be reflected in the points of view of the administrators of academic and public libraries. Even the individuals who felt the impact would be great were not carried away as reflected in the following comments:

> Obviously the individual library would have to work at providing all services possible--without outside regional or national library networks.
>
> Considerably. Networks won't blossom overnight but they are definitely in the future. Good possibility--should influence the individual library's collection, space needs, etc. A special library and information center should know the plans and react accordingly.

For a great many of the respondents the perspective was one of watching and waiting without a strong commitment as active, participating and motivating members. This point of view is summarized in the following quotation:

> Probably little during the next five years; maybe even ten, since such networks seem unlikely to be effectively operating before then. Individual libraries and information centers should however keep informed of progress and be ready to avail themselves of services as they become available.

It was the unusual respondent who identified an important interest here which required leadership from the special library movement or from his own position. The following response was therefore uncommon:

> Special libraries and information centers should no longer attempt to function alone. Obviously certain material must be confidential in competitive situations. In general, however, information acquisition and transfer is now too large and expensive a responsibility to be sustained individually. Selective responsibility, shared use of suitable materials, cooperative enterprises are necessities. As one who is engaged in such a cooperative enterprise I know full well however that acceptance is a slow process and a cause more often under duress, or at least approached cautiously.

A limited number of respondents felt that the entire notion was confused or wrong headed:

> I feel it will have very little influence in this time span. People in corporations will not wait the necessary time to obtain the material from centers until such a time as they are all hooked up to your lines.

> It seems to me contrary to the great local movement which is taking place in this country. There are some services and functions which can only be effectively done on a larger scale, but these can be regionalized, and the small units should be extended locally even more than they are now.

PASSIVE-ACTIVE ORIENTATION. In the questionnaire to each administrative group, several questions were inserted to assess the service commitment of the administrators. It was expected that the special library and information center administrator would have the most active service commitment.

Almost one-half agreed that "There is not much the average reference librarian does which could not be done by an intelligent college graduate after a minimum period of in-service training." Although 44% disagreed, this finding deserves comparison with the 69%, 68%, and 63% in academic, school,and public library settings respectively who disagreed. Only 22% agreed that "Knowledge of the collection is more important than knowledge of the user," while 59% disagreed. Some 35% agreed that "Reducing processing backlogs is more important than insisting on accuracy." While 45% disagreed with this statement,it is of note again that three-fourths of academic and public library administrators reacted negatively to a similar question. Of the special library administrators,22% were prepared to say that "We will be remembered not for the service we gave but for the collections we leave behind us," although 57% did not agree. A large 85% agreed that "Users need to be helped to help themselves." And 52% agreed that "Users frequently demand services they should be doing themselves," with the lowest degree of concurrence (38%) among company library administrators. Also 47% felt that "While reaching unserved elements is desirable, most libraries and information centers have all they can do to keep up with their present users," while only 28% disagreed with the statement. Opinion was divided on "Serving the personal or non-work related interests of people is not a legitimate function of the special library or information center." While 47% agreed, 37% disagreed. Interestingly enough,responses to the last two questions would tend to suggest that the industrial library administrator defines both client and service in the most specific terms: in contrast to the distribution of the total group,62% agreed with the first statement and 62% with the second. There was little subgroup variation in response to the query "Centralization is the best way to organize collections and services for scattered users in the same organizations." In all, 45% agreed, while 29% disagreed.

When asked "There has been some recent establishment of information centers to supplement existing libraries. Some people feel that this restricts the library to what is almost a custodial function. What are your feelings?" a small number of respondents disagreed, for they felt that the libraries are reinforced through the existence of the information center:

> On the contrary they free libraries to be human and humane--if they would choose to be.
>
> The information centers are a valuable ancillary tool for the librarian.

However, a larger number of respondents agreed and saw this as a danger to the library over time:

> I agree, the librarians have to get with it, lead out or the profession of librarian will become nonexistent If the libraries do not fill the need of their communities, someone else certainly will.

For a number of respondents, libraries are information centers ,and if they are not and are not so functioning, then they cannot be expected to continue as anything more than a holding operation. Yet some saw unique functions which could be carried on in an information center which libraries could not manage by virtue of the limits of their history and their expertise. The following quotations are illustrative of some of the points made:

> Isn't this a matter of semantics? A good live library is an information center; any information center has to have some custodial functions.
>
> There is a service requirement--if not provided by the library, it will be provided by others. And if the library fails to recognize this fact, it rightfully deserves to become custodial.

For a few respondents the question of where responsibility resides is a crucial matter and will decide the future of the special library:

> If libraries had not abdicated all but a custodial role, they would be an integral if not central part of such information centers. Too often librarians demonstrate more zeal in seeing that each and every holding is on its shelf rather than in determining what new holdings are needed by users and what services can be added to help users make better use of the library.

> Where this has happened I can't help but feel that the librarian is responsible. If librarians refuse to provide dynamic information services the users want, someone else steps in and provides it.
>
> If the librarian is smart he does not let his firm set up a separate information center. He makes his library the information center by keeping his eyes, ears, and lines of communication constantly open.
>
> Libraries must expand to hold onto the supplementary agencies. If they cannot run and control such they should be custodial. I think there must be a separation of general tidbit information center and solid research collections as well as the public type libraries, but all run under one head, the library administrator, who must expand his ideas.

For a limited number of respondents the form of the material was the crucial question and would have decided impact on where the responsibility genuinely belongs.

> These information centers for the most part are true supplements in that they deal with technical reports, specifications, drawings, and other such data. As long as the library continues to deal with new information solely in the form of books and serials, it is little more than a storage center. Library schools have ignored the technical report and other technical data. Therefore the librarian usually has no desire to administer this type of information. This is a mistake.

OTHER ISSUES. To learn respondents' opinions about preparation for special library work, they were asked "Special library and information service is frequently of such a nature that both preparation in librarianship and in a specific subject discipline are desirable. If the combination background is unobtainable, which do you feel is more important for the successful operation of the service?" The respondents seemed to be divided almost equally between the number who specified the subject discipline versus those who opted for librarianship, although the edge was on the side of the subject discipline. A good number of respondents hedged on this and stated that the type of library situation or the type of assignment would be a significant variable in determining who would be more appropriate. The following quotations illustrate some of the reasons specified:

> For an administrator--librarianship, for assistants in the library--subject fields.

> It depends upon whether you serve subject oriented people or not and the number of people on the information center staff. It is my opinion that someone, a librarian, must keep the store, or "no one can deliver the goods."
>
> The answer depends on the nature of the organization. A special library which serves a wide variety of subject interests is best served by personnel highly competent in librarianship. An organization in which the interests are fairly narrowly confined to a single subject discipline requires first and foremost an individual versed in the discipline.
>
> It depends entirely on the specific job being filled. e.g., for depth research as literary research analysts, subject background (training and experience) is more important; for indexing and cataloging, library science training is essential.

The range of responses tended to form along the lines of the personal background and propensity of the individual respondent. Classic librarian types chose librarianship, while those who came through a subject speciality tended to see it as the paramount need. Some of the respondents who identified subject orientation as the basic requirement appeared to consider the library function as a rather routine, ritualistic aspect of the work. In this view of the custodial or technical responsibility of librarianship, the subject expertise clearly loomed larger in significance.

On the question "Within management structures, libraries and information centers are most frequently placed in either the administrative or research hierarchy. Which do you consider preferable and to what extent do you consider it a significant factor in achieving your goals?" respondents were evenly divided. Essentially, those who opted for the administrative-management side cited access to resources. The following remarks illustrate the point:

> Prefer administrative. This places the centers in direct competition with other support functions.
>
> Administrative because that is where the power is and where the financial decisions are made.
>
> Administrative--fewer obstacles in getting budgets approved and personnel.

On the research side the arguments were based upon the relationship to the clientele group within an organization in which there is a distinctive research activity.

> I have heard opinions on both sides. I feel that research is a main part of our profession. I do not feel that we will be barred from working with the administration just because we are not directly under their authority. If it is necessary for administration to have a hand in decisions, I think it is still possible to communicate with them.
>
> Having been under both research and administrative supervision it is my belief (as well as my professional staff) that the library flourishes better in a scientific environment under a research supervisor. This is chiefly due to the researchers' appreciation and empathy for technical information and the mission of the research library. Under a strictly administrative type of supervisor to whom the library administrator must report, the results are less than rewarding. Frequently the library is equated with the janitorial, purchasing, and other miscellaneous company functions which are lumped together.
>
> Placement in research is far better since that is where the prime users are. These users can determine their own needs and decide how they can be met and how much they are willing to spend to meet them. Lumping libraries with accounting and maintenance tends to make them overhead operations insulated from the users by red tape and cost distribution.

There were a number of respondents who felt that the specific location in the organizational hierarchy was less crucial than the relationships which could be established depending upon the personalities involved and the individual organizational structure:

> I have experienced both and recognize negative and positive aspects of both. The research management develops and facilitates good communication with its client population, but does not emphasize good management techniques. The administrative management does emphasize good management and planning and in my estimation provides more library service per dollar expenditure. Perhaps rotation between the two would be an ideal form.

While the basic difference is between organizational placement in an administrative line or in research, a very small number of respondents felt that the library belonged in neither. The following quotations illustrate the point:

> I do not think the library should be in any department but should function as an independent unit, that is if it serves the whole organization. When the library serves the whole organization it should not be in the research as the personnel in such department feel too superior to waste their time with non-research requests. And in this way it can be attractive to everybody in the whole organization.

> It depends upon the divisional setup. The important thing is for the librarian to answer to someone at the vice-presidential level.

PART TWO

THE SITUATION OF THE LIBRARY ADMINISTRATOR

The special library and information center administrator needs to be examined in the context of the situation in which he functions. To understand his job attitudes one must have some knowledge of his working environment. For a total view of the administrator as change agent, his professional change attitudes need to be cast against and compared with his attitudes toward change in his own organization. It is for these reasons that a considerable portion of the study questionnaire explored the situation of the administrator.

Descriptive information was collected about the institution he serves and about the nature of the library or information center services. Several organizational factors which were considered to be closely related to an organization's ability to change and to adapt were explored particularly. These included such personnel aspects as staff background, staff organization, and opportunities for in-service training. In addition to these internal elements a number of questions explored factors in the external environment of the library or information center that were considered relevant to its capacity for change. Because such a broad range of factors was examined, no one of them was explored in depth; areas must be considered to have been opened for further,more intensive study.

The Library's Community

Special library and information centers represented by this sample service a wide variety of clienteles depending, most directly, on the character of the organization or structure within which they operate.

Table 19

Type Of Institution Served

	Percent
Government	35
Company	36
Scientific, technical, or learned society	7
Other (e.g., government contractor, nonprofit association, professional society)	20
No response	2

The size of the potential user component ranges from relatively precise groups (the personnel of the parent company) to the entire population of a given state (a state library) to the loosely defined "research and academic community" (some archival operations).

One-third of the respondents specifically described the major activity of the institution served as research or research and development; others are engaged in the production of consumer goods and services, with the aircraft, publishing, petroleum, and pharmaceutical industries most heavily represented in this study. Approximately 15% serve other libraries or the public directly.

As Table 20 shows, respondents' libraries run the gamut of subject orientations, but scientific and technological interests are clearly dominant.

Table 20

Type Of Library Subject Matter*

	Percent
Engineering and Science	52
Humanities (including history)	11
Medical	5
Social Sciences	5
Publishing	5
Business	4
Law	4
State Library	12
Other	2

*This table did not emerge directly from data collected, but was constructed as a part of sample analysis (see p. 68)

The Nature of Special Library and Information Center Service

Implicit in the "special library" designation is an assumption that both its services and materials will show some significant variation from those offered by the academic, public, or school library facility--or, at the very least, that they will be more sharply tailored to the requirements of a particular clientele. As the table following indicates, almost three-fourths of the libraries surveyed collect report literature and a range of specialized materials is available.

Table 21

Types of Specialized Materials Offered

	Percent
Reports	70
Clippings	41
Films	25
Patents	18
Slides	14
Magnetic tapes	12
Engineering drawings	10
Other materials (e.g., microfilm, pictures, government documents, maps, catalogs)	60
No response	15

In an effort to determine the character of special library and information center policy (and practice) with regard to reference and bibliographic services, respondents were presented with a number of possibilities. Table 22 shows their responses.

Table 22

Reference Services

	Percent
Ready reference service is given	82
Users are given assistance in getting started on library research	61
We do some literature searching on demand, but do not volunteer the service	30
No response	3

They were also invited to name other or alternate policies, and 21% reported that extensive literature searching, in-depth research, and the assembly of bibliographic materials are standard operating procedures. Of the respondents 11% indicated that the extent of service rendered depends on who asks for it, and 10% stated that their facility tried to respond to any demands put upon it.

A general announcing service for their users is provided by 76% of the special library and information centers sampled, although few (18%) appear to have gone beyond a fairly standard acquisitions/ accession list to include annotations, abstracts, or table of contents reproduction. Of the group 8% indicated that their listing is computer-produced, most typically as a by-product of other automated operations. With respect to individualized "current awareness" projects, one-third reported that their facility is engaged in one or another form of S.D.I. (Selective Dissemination of Information). As described by respondents, approximately half of these programs employ a computer match of profile and document descriptors (utilizing NASA/SCAN or other tape services in some cases), while the balance of such efforts is largely informal in nature and consists of routing materials of known special interest.

An invitation to list additional specialized user services was responded to by 51% of special library and information center administrators. Among those services mentioned with some degree of frequency were the preparation of bibliographies, indexes, and catalogs of varying levels of complexity, and translating, abstracting, or data analysis capabilities. Two respondents stated that their operation is equipped to perform machine searches of relevant material.

Changes in Special Libraries and Information Centers

A major section of the questionnaires directed to academic, public, school, and special library and information center administrators during the course of this study solicited specific information on the degree and extent of change which has occurred within the libraries themselves over the past four years. In posing this set of questions, the investigators were concerned to identify basic modifications in purpose or direction as opposed to predominantly procedural changes. They hoped, also, to gather evidence of genuine innovation, in the sense of departures from traditional approaches and operations.

While the response patterns of administrators in other types of libraries posed no particular problems in this area, it quickly became apparent that it was neither feasible nor realistic to consider the answers of special library and information center directors as constituting a single entity.* For here the use of the common descriptor "special library" broke down. There was no "special library"; there were only discrete and differentiated kinds of special libraries, each with its own peculiar bias, constituency, and organizational commitment. In reviewing the evidence of the institutional change queries, therefore, it became necessary to perceive the responses based upon the organizational context in which they were proferred. In consequence, the perspectives of respondents have been categorized and broad generalizations made only about discrete subgroups rather than for the entire universe of the special library and information center.

For the special library or information center director engaged in an engineering or applied scientific context, the primary variations reduced themselves to restructured organizational situations, to the widespread utilization and application of microform technology, and to the increased use of data processing and computer technology for housekeeping and for retrieval purposes. The variability was great and ranged from the identification of on-line circulation systems to computerized retrieval, including demand searches, and on into heavy and extensive use of microfiche and microfilm as the media of choice. In contrasting the responses of the libraries in more scientific rather than applied settings with those of their engineering counterparts, it was difficult to differentiate the two groups simply by using the criterion of change phenomena which respondents themselves considered to be of note. The

---

*With this caveat, the list of questions and response data are included in the Supplemental Tables to indicate the range of inquiry.

implementation of S.D.I. systems was cited by some respondents in both types of libraries and reorganization of the library in its general organizational context, with consolidation and increased scale of staff, was mentioned by others. The application of computer technology to the library was less pronounced in the comments from the scientific libraries than from those of an engineering cast. Among the respondents in business, social science, publishing, and law libraries there were no clearcut characteristics which would be broadly applicable. Since the sample of each was extremely small, the responses did not add up to any meaningful insight into the nature of the most important recent changes. The same may be said for those medical, law, and historical libraries included in the survey data.

As indicated, major modifications identified by the special libraries and information centers in the sample varied widely, but one common characteristic threaded through a number of the responses. This was the development of mechanisms for statewide cooperative arrangements including the development of book catalogs, modification and adaption of interlibrary loan procedures and network arrangements, and utilization of the technical means for improved information services throughout the region.

Cooperative endeavors and the use of technology received additional attention in a later portion of the questionnaire, eliciting more precise measures of the extent to which special libraries and information centers across the board are availing themselves of these possibilities. Viewed as a whole then, 60% of respondents' libraries have automated some part of their operations to date (compared to 43%, 57%, and 34% in academic, public, and school libraries respectively). Although such implementation in other types of libraries sampled has tended to concentrate in the technical services area, the most pervasive use of mechanized routines in special libraries and information centers leans toward public services.

Table 23

Types of Automation

	Percent
Retrieval	32
Dissemination	27
Serials	25
Publication	24
Ordering	18
Circulation	16
Other (e.g., business operations)	4
None or no response	40

One-third of the libraries sampled have taken advantage of computer potential for the specific purposes displayed in Table 24.

Table 24

Use of Computerization

	Percent*
Prepare a book catalog	63
Analyze your collection	34
Analyze use	22
Other analyses (e.g. index preparation, cost or systems analysis, thesaurus development)	50

*Base = those who responded to this question

Administrators were also asked to detail any plans for automation in the future. As shown in Table 25,a broad spectrum emerged with no one application establishing clear priority.

Table 25

Plans For Future Automation

	Percent
Total percent of libraries reporting plans	64
Retrieval	15
Dissemination	13
Publication	13
Ordering	13
Circulation	13
Alert to any possibilities	13
Serials	10
Total system	7
Other (e.g., improvement of existing operations, conversion to on-line system)	14
None	11
No response	25

Only one-third of this respondent group reported participation in formal cooperative ventures aimed at extending the resources and services of individual libraries. While the overall incidence is low (approximately twice as many academic and public libraries indicated participation), it is unlikely that the more sharply focused requirements of these facilities would dictate heavy involvement in the local and regional arrangements favored by other types of libraries. Indeed, the distinct majority of special libraries and information centers committed to interlibrary programs reported the use of NASA, DOD, and other tape and microfiche services--national efforts designed to meet fairly well-defined and continuing information needs. The following table outlines the chief advantages of such arrangements specified by respondents.

Table 26

Advantages of Interlibrary Cooperation

	Percent*
Access to materials elsewhere not readily available	69
Information about material on a more comprehensive basis	59
Adds to materials acquired by the library	52
Increased speed of interlibrary loan	38
Arrangement for direct use by your clientele of other libraries	35
Speed of access to cataloging information	21
Storage space for little used materials	10
Other advantages (e.g., increased scope of S.D.I., reduction in time for receipt and dissemination of information)	10

*Base = those who responded to this question

Internal Change Factors

PERSONNEL. As with the top administrator, the sex, education, and continuity of special library and information center professional staff were judged potentially relevant to a library's capacity for change. The average male population in this type of facility is 38%, an almost exact approximation of the situation in academic libraries surveyed. However, there is considerable variation in the distribution. As the table following shows, in 30% of special library and information centers men occupy more than 50% of the professional positions (the comparable figure for academic libraries is 17%). Of note too is the finding that 21% of these responding institutions have no men at all on their staffs (as opposed to 4% of academic libraries).

Table 27

Proportion Of Male Professionals

Percent Men	Percent of Institutions*
0	21
1 - 10	4
11 - 20	7
21 - 30	9
31 - 40	19
41 - 50	6
51 - 60	3
61 - 75	19
76 - 100	12

*Base = those who responded to this question

In only 15% of the reporting institutions has better than half of the staff been in their present positions for more than ten years.

Table 28

Proportion Of Staff Who Have Been With The Library Or Information Center More Than Ten Years

Percent of Staff	Percent of Institutions*
0	33
1 - 25	25
26 - 50	28
51 - 75	9
76 - 100	6

*Base = those who responded to this question

Although 64% of this group of administrators specified that at least one member of their staff holds a Master's Degree in a field other than librarianship, the proportion reporting distribution by subject area was somewhat lower (51%). As might be expected, the following composite table (Table 29) indicates that the paucity of science and engineering degrees in academic and public libraries studied is not duplicated in the special library and information centers providing data.

Table 29

Distribution Of Subject Master's Degrees

Number of Masters	Percent of Institutions*		
	Humanities	Social Sciences	Science and Engineering
0	49	63	49
1	12	24	20
2	12	8	20
3	12	0	8
4	8	2	2
5	6	2	0
6	2	2	0
More than 6	0	0	2

*Base = those who responded to this question

With respect t staff opportunities for continuing education, 60% of special library and information centers surveyed report arrangements for leaves of absence for study purposes, with full or partial institutional subsidy provided in three-fourths of the cases. In 73% of these organizations, at least one staff member has taken a leave of absence during the last three years. Respondents stated that professional personnel in 66% of their facilities are presently engaged in advanced study at one or another level.

As an additional aspect of staff capacity to respond knowledgeably to current advances and explorations in the information field, one question examined attendance at special institutes, conferences and continuing education programs (exclusive of professional association meetings) during the past year. Half of the responding organizations indicated that one or more members of the staff had participated in such activity; the distribution by type of program is displayed in Table 30.

Table 30

Type Of Program

	Percent*
Technology, data processing, automation	55
Administration	45
Advanced computer-based systems (e.g., MARC, MEDLARS)	23
Handling of special materials such as microform, archives	17
Control, servicing of materials (e.g., cataloging, bibliographic control)	13
Service to special clientele (e.g., industry law, handicapped)	13
Interlibrary cooperation (e.g., TWX, networks)	9
Collections (e.g., acquisitions, selection in subject areas)	6
Other (e.g., area workshops and conferences)	28

*Base = those who responded to this question

Given the intense interest in job definition within the information fields at this time, two personnel factors seemed of particular note--the use of technicians and subprofessionals and the role of professionals from other disciplines or orientations. Better than two-thirds of the special library and information center respondents employ technicians or subprofessionals, most typically in the housekeeping areas of technical services and circulation. However, one-fourth report the use of other than professional personnel in the reference function. Where supervisory roles were specified (again approximately one-fourth

the largest number administer technical/technological operations, circulation services, or small branch facilities.

Non-library trained professionals occupy positions in 47% of the special library and information centers sampled. The range and degree of employment is wide; at one extreme non-librarians comprise the entire professional staff, and at the other a part-time translator is used on occasion. Systems analysts, subject and literature analysts, technical information specialists,and a variety of managerial positions were the most frequently cited occupational categories, with translating, editing, and archival work listed several times each. In the relatively small number of cases where professional background was described, chemists, physicists, and engineers emerged as the dominant group

ORGANIZATIONAL RELATIONSHIPS: Most organization theorists identify resistance to change as a standard characteristic of the bureaucratic structure and some argue strongly for more democratic forms of governance as one way to facilitate continuing institutional adaptability. The main thrust of the currently popular "management by objectives" style of administration posits active staff participation in the goal decisions of the organization and, where successful, would serve also to create an environment in which qualified personnel can operate effectively as a force for change. For this reason, and considering too their putative roles as the guardians of professional interests, the degree of staff involvement in library decision making seemed of obvious relevance to this study. Presented with a range of possibilities going from complete control by professional personnel to complete control by the administrator, respondents were asked to indicate who makes the major decision in their facilities. Their evaluations are shown in Table 31.

Table 31

Decision Making Practices

	Percent
While I rely on members of the staff for advice, the final decisions rest with me	24
The heads of departments make decisions in their own area. Any major change would be referred to me	23
The professional staff makes the final decisions on some matters, while I do on others	14
I make all the major decisions in this library	10
The professional staff makes the major decisions in this library (or information center)	5
More than one statement checked	15
No response	10

On the basis of this evidence, special library and information centers, like the other types of libraries, appear to conform to bureaucratic norms with respect to their internal situation despite the relatively small size of their staff components. Of interest here is the lack of substantial organizational conflict reported. To the degree that bureaucratic modes of operation tend to perpetuate the status quo they must ignore or suppress conflict and inhibit its acknowledged utility in a change-oriented environment.

Table 32

Conflict In Libraries

	Percent
Personal differences among staff members	51
Conflict between departments	23
Conflict over the need for change or the types of change	21
Conflict over the management of the library	7
No response	33

It should be emphasized that these findings reflect solely the viewpoint of the administrator and it may be that he simply chooses to see whatever conflict exists largely in terms of trivial differences which pose no threat to his situation. By and large, however, it is a discouraging note that so few libraries surveyed (including academic, public, and school libraries) reported conflict over the issue of change, for without re-evaluation, challenge, and a variety of input, the chances for needed change are considerably diminished.

Respondents were also polled on the change attitudes of their staffs. Seen again from the administrators' vantage point, only a small amount of unilateral resistance exists, which reinforces their report that there is little real conflict over change within special libraries and information centers.

Table 33

Staff Attitudes Toward Change

	Percent
We have a number of staff members who are highly motivated to make change	63
Most of our staff would go along with changes if they were not too radical	43
We have a number of senior staff members who are opposed to change	13
We lack the expertise at present to make many needed changes	6
Other	3
No response	10

Given this degree of perceived unanimity and, as previously indicated, the relatively small voice of professional staff in major decisions, internal pressure for organizational change at the moment would seem to depend almost entirely on the perception and disposition of the chief administrator.

FORMAL ORGANIZATION FOR CHANGE. In addition to constructive staff participation in the decision making process, there are a number of ways in which organizations can maximize their "capacity for change." One such strategy establishes regular procedures for continuing analysis of the institutional environment in order to permit appropriate responses to--and, at best, anticipate--changes in the external situation. In this connection, answers to the question "Does your library or information center (continuously or at regular intervals and by plan or program) ascertain and analyze any of the following?" are displayed in Table 34.

Table 34

Types Of Information Regularly Collected And Analyzed

	Percent
Volumes added to the collection	68
What users want	67
Volume of use made of various services	67
Satisfaction of users	59
The changing needs of the user population	58
Validation of continuing need for existing programs and services	57
Collection weaknesses	54
Work output of department	51
Proportion of filled to unfilled requests	41
Unit cost analysis	41
Proportion of the potential user population using the library or information center's services	38
Cost effectiveness studies	32
Characteristics of its users compared with the total population	31
Other evaluation (e.g., contents of journals and report literature, space and manpower utilization)	6
No response	14

As in all other types of libraries sampled, collection concerns head the list,as shown in Table 34, but no dramatic imbalance between collection and user analyses emerge from the special library and information center findings detailed. Across the board fewer of these facilities report systematic procedures for collecting this variety of data than do academic and public libraries (90% of academic libraries and three-fourths of the public libraries studied regularly analyze volumes added to their collections; 55% of school libraries engage in a similar process at either the system or building level).

Supplementing the above, 49% of special library and information center respondents indicated that one or another aspect of their program had been subjected to special study during the past three years. Most typically this was an in-house operation and concentrated on evaluation of user services (S.D.I., interlibrary loan, microform and periodical usage) or management tools such as systems or cost analysis. A small proportion were specifically concerned with mechanization.

Another key adaptive technique is formalization of the change process. Organizations accomplish this in a number of ways, including the establishment of separate planning units and the use of special ad hoc groups for specific planning and problem solving purposes. The main point here is that an organization must consciously arrange for time and resources to be put into change processes lest commitment to ongoing operations preclude the initiation and success of any but minor changes. The study sought, therefore, to determine whether the planning function has been legitimized within the library situation and in what ways.

A total of 43% of special library and information center administrators responded affirmatively to a question inviting them to describe any special provisions for planning and for the initiation and implementation of change. In the great majority of cases, a specific planning unit or device was not stipulated and probably does not exist--which is hardly surprising considering the size of many of the facilities involved. Respondents did mention staff assignments and committees for long-range planning responsibility or the use of budgetary projections as a framework for regular self-assessment. In general, answers tended to reflect a view that planning is an implicit part of the management process and as such will receive proper attention as a matter of course.

External Change Factors

Special library and information centers are creatures of the parent organization and cannot be fully understood apart from the environment which provides their clientele and their support. Analysis of the facility in terms of its relationships with top management and user elements should give us significant insights into its need and prospects for change, and provide some clues about the nature of influence from these two quarters. Although it was not feasible to explore thoroughly such dimensions within the broader context and objectives of this study, it seemed possible to determine what mechanisms for interaction exist and to gain some understanding of how they are being utilized at the present time.

EXTERNAL RELATIONSHIPS. One-third of this administrative group reports directly to the chief executive officer or policy making body of the organization served, as opposed to 11% of respondents within academic institutions (the most structurally similar of the library types analyzed). Without detailed knowledge of individual organization charts further comparisons are highly qualified, but it would appear that, in all, a larger proportion of special libraries and information centers occupy a lower position in the overall hierarchy than do academic libraries; better than two-thirds of academic libraries are responsible to a very senior official in a centralized administration whereas 42% of special library and information center administrators indicate that the manager of a division or department is their immediate supervisor. Unfortunately the data did not make it possible to isolate the position of the information center or library in the overall organization.

Some indication of the organizational relationship between special library and information center executives and their management, however designated, is displayed in Table 35. Assuming the validity of respondents' perceptions, it is interesting to note that the larger structure is somewhat less "bureaucratic" in its decision making practices than the library itself (see p. 52).

Table 35

Decision Making Relationships
Between Library And Management

	Percent
While I take into account the suggestions of my supervisor, I make the major decisions in this library	35
All decisions regarding the library are made jointly based on discussion between my supervisor and myself	18
I make ongoing operational decisions while any policy changes would be decided by my supervisor	15
While my supervisor relies on me for advice, the final decisions rest with him	3
Policy changes affecting the library are frequently made by my supervisor without consulting me	1
More than one statement checked	14
No response	15

Although several questions explored the existence of formalized structures for interaction between the information facility and the larger organization, the reported incidence of such mechanisms was low. Only one-fourth of the respondents stipulated the establishment of a library committee (appointed by management in the majority of cases) and less than half of these administrators (40%) serve on policy or advisory bodies of the parent institution.

CLIENT DEMANDS. As shown in Table 36,respondents' perceptions of the pressures being placed on their facilities are fairly modest, with a desire for stepped-up processing procedures being the only user demand reported by better than one-half of this group. While the nature and variety of client pressures stipulated by academic, public, and school library respondents differs with the type of library* it is perhaps worth noting that, overall, the special library and information center administrator perceives the least clamor from this quarter.

*Academic libraries reported pressure for longer library hours from 74%, for an increase in the speed of processing materials from 68%. Public libraries reported pressure for branch facilities from 74%, for longer hours of opening from 58%. School libraries reported pressure for an increase in the speed of processing materials from 65%, for longer library hours from 59%.

Table 36

Respondent's Perception Of External Demands
On His Facility

Nature of Pressure	Percent Reporting Pressure		
	A Great Deal	Some	Total
Increase in speed of processing materials	12	40	52
Initiation of new or increased services, such as literature searches, retrieval, dissemination	10	32	42
More extensive copying services	8	34	42
More reference service	7	31	38
Expansion to include additional kinds of materials	5	28	33
Greater share of books for departmental retention	10	19	29
Improved interlibrary loan	3	23	26
Establishment of branch libraries	3	22	25
Better control over materials	5	15	20
More liberal circulation policies	5	15	20
Longer hours of service	1	17	18
Greater say in the management of the library	0	5	5
Other demands (e.g., housing for personal collections, improved staff training)	3	8	11

The Library Administrator In His Situation

Organizational change is more likely to occur when the top administrator is dissatisfied with the present state of affairs and when his aspiration level is high and accompanied by a measure of impatience. For this reason, the investigators were particularly interested in determining how satisfied respondents are with the changes taking place in their libraries. Approximating the distribution in other types of libraries sampled, special library and information center administrators characterized their satisfaction "quotient" as follows:

Table 37

Administrator's Satisfaction With Rate Of Change In His Library

	Percent
Very satisfied	19
Reasonably satisfied	51
Not satisfied	24
No response	6

The short and long term aspirations of the administrator for his library suggest his expectations and are indicative of his conception of the role and responsibility of his facility. Indeed, his degree of expectation, whether positive or negative, may influence his capacity to achieve the goals he has set.

In response to a question which invited them to report what they would like to see happen in their situations in the short-run, there was widespread consensus as to the changes which directors of special libraries of all types sought for the near future. These were increases in the size and calibre of staff, increased availability of funds for personnel and for general library or information center purposes, and increased space within which the facility might function. These three points were emphasized by a very high proportion of respondents regardless of the kind of special library setting represented. A small number identified greater availability of computer time, reorganization within the context of the parent organization, or improved organizational relationships for the facility with management personnel. On balance however, there was a high degree of congruence as to the most essential

short-term priorities and this was true despite the differences among special library and information center situations.

With respect to long-run expectations, it was clearly necessary to differentiate by type of facility. For the engineering and applied science library, the most frequently identified objective appeared to be the development of a corporate or organization-wide library and information service program which would vest complete responsibility for such a system within the library. A number of respondents specified that an ideal system would be automated with on-line capacity for information retrieval. Some of these administrators also stipulated the need for organizational restructuring so as to place the library in a more strategic position--reporting, for instance, directly to the highest level official.

The responses of the special library directors in the science settings overlap those of the engineering group. Again, a high premium was placed upon advanced utilization of mechanization in order to facilitate establishment of a central information system for the overall organization. There was more emphasis here on the need for added managerial support for the information program and on the desirability of providing more individualized approaches to clientele services than is now possible.

Among the other types of special libraries and information centers represented, there did not appear to be great consistency about the nature of long-term aspirations other than the fact that the long-term was not differentiated from the short-term. Many of the respondents stated, that is, that their short and long-run hopes were essentially the same. However, some administrators from the state library group did specify increased automation of activities with particular emphasis upon acquisitions, transmission, and statewide network arrangements. Physical plant was mentioned by a small number as well as the accelerated use of microfilm and microform to replace original materials. Nonetheless, no common long-term desires stretched across the whole continuum of special librarianship, once the engineering and science groups were characterized.

Responses to the questions "What are the prospects of realizing your aims? What stands in the way? Please explain your situation. Is your management aware of and does it support your objectives?" proved difficult to capture by generalization. What emerged instead was a variety of opinion about the ultimate prospects for the libraries sampled. The determining factors specified by respondents differed to some degree but essentially they reduced to the central question of eliciting sufficient support from either corporate or legislative management. Even when sympathetic--and a number of respondents specified that they were--the parent organization tends not to have enough resources with which to meet all of the ends deemed necessary. Among

the engineering and science personnel, optimism and pessimism were about equally displayed. A large number of respondents identified the fact that prospects were variable as a function of the economic conditions obtaining within the firm or within the jurisdiction to which control of their facilities was subject.

For the state libraries, the question was whether or not the federal government would continue to make resources available and whether state legislatures could provide necessary support. A small number of state library directors were quite pessimistic about the outlook for their libraries both with respect to financial constraints and the limits of personnel available to them.

A further series of questions asked the administrator to characterize his own role in planning and bringing about change. While 53% stated that they initiated most of the ideas for change themselves, 15% reported that their contribution varied. A high 80% indicated that they had a major involvement in the implementation of new ideas.

Two additional change-related opinions were solicited: the administrator's attitude toward staff participation in decision making, and his reaction to the demands being placed upon his library or information center. With respect to the appropriateness of the decision making process in their own facilities, 84% reported satisfaction with their present arrangements. Added comments on this issue displayed wide variation with the type of organizational setting less prominent as a differentiating factor than the respondent's own view of the role of the professional in decision making. Perhaps the largest number of administrators suggested that although there should be a high degree of staff involvement in discussion and deliberation of alternatives, (with particular emphasis upon those related to change) final responsibility rested with the chief administrative figure who operated within a context of overall organizational objectives. The larger the size of the organization, the greater was the prospect that the respondent would indicate that there were formal mechanisms for groups to convene to discuss policy questions.

Some 83% of this group felt that the external pressures being placed on their library or information center were largely reasonable and only 3% described such demands as unreasonable.

In answer to a question which asked them to assess the pressure being put upon their facilities, respondents could be divided about equally into two groups: one set of administrators felt that although demands were generally reasonable, financial, personnel, and/or space constraints limited adequate adaptation at this time; the other set reported that their facilities were able to keep pace with expressed desires and deplored only the paucity of genuine interest which might produce a kind of pressure they would welcome. These two response patterns seemed to cut across the field, with no one type of special

library or information center subscribing exclusively to either view.

Perhaps the most revealing insight into the administrator's fundamental posture toward change and the strength of his personal commitment may be gauged by his response to the question "In attempting to effect change in most special library and information center situations, which of the following are called for?" Responses are shown in Table 38.

Table 38

Respondents' Evaluation Of
Suggested Change Strategies

	Percent		
	Very Advisable	Not Appropriate	Not Checked
Willingness to take temporary defeat without giving up ultimate objectives	91	3	3
Willingness to see the library's needs for support in relation to other needs of the organization	88	7	1
Finesse in getting changes accepted by administrations	87	7	2
Recognition that lasting change is not made overnight	78	14	5
Seize on opportunities as they arise: "strike while the iron is hot."	77	16	4
Conducting a careful and methodical program of introducing developments using caution and restraint	77	13	7
Maintaining sound relationships with influential people and groups within the organization by keeping them satisfied	76	16	5
Adopt a forceful, aggressive approach to effecting change	66	33	2
Choosing dramatic innovations as the way to enhance the climate for change acceptance	36	58	3
Readiness to leave if requests are not met in a reasonable time	16	77	4
No response	-	-	3

CONCLUSIONS

In drawing conclusions about the administrators of the special library or information center, the problem of generalizing about this group must again be emphasized. Treatment of these administrators as a group is questionable because of the dissimilarity among the units included in the sample, ranging as it does from archivists and state librarians to administrators of information analysis centers. This is in contrast to the other types of library administrators who have been studied in different portions of the overall research program, where each group was distinctive and identifiably engaged in similar effort in a comparable organizational form. Not only do the forms of service vary widely within the present group, but the typical characteristic of the special library, service to a distinctive, basically homogeneous constituency, was not always present. And while subgroups within the special library group were analyzed separately, the small number in these subgroups precluded drawing any definitive conclusions about sub-elements in special librarianship. Findings presented here can only be considered suggestive, awaiting further analysis based on more extensive data. And again, in considering these conclusions, the reader must bear in mind that the fundamental commonality of the total group is that those included are not academic, public, or school library administrators.

If the special library administrator was expected to be quite different from administrators in other settings--a more aggressive leader committed to a changed sense of the library mission, or a special breed of professional assaulting conventional library ideology in quest of a revised role or mandate, this was not found. On balance the administrator of the special library or information center is no more aggressive about change strategy than his counterpart in other types of libraries, no more willing to put his job on the line to force modification, no less satisfied with the rate of change in his facility, no more inclined to encourage the non-authoritarian forms of governance expected more nearly to catalyze and to support change. While he may reveal a more pronounced tendency to be mobile than administrators in other types of libraries, he shares with them the view that the rate of progress of his unit is satisfactory, with lack of resources, money and staff the only real deterrents to improving the situation. He displays no massive, action-oriented dissatisfaction with the goals, the present service capabilities or the status quo of the field. As is true of his counterparts in other libraries, his propensity is toward gradual modification over time.

There were, however, distinguishing personal characteristics of this group. Fewer come to their positions through the entry point of library education. A lesser number are drawn from the humanistic disciplines so predominant in other forms of librarianship. A significantly smaller percent belong to the American Library Association. As particular subgroups within the sample are analyzed, the variations in background

become more striking. Suggestive are the findings with regard to the administrators in industrial and governmental settings (36% and 35% of the sample respectively). Less than one-half of the company library administrators have had formal library education; a markedly higher proportion took their degrees in the scientific and technological fields; only 21% belong to the American Library Association; and only 56%, as contrasted with 66% of the entire special library sample, identify themselves as "Librarian." Respondents within governmental organizations, on the other hand, appear to be more nearly comparable to their peers in the academic, public, and school library form rather than with the company library administrators with whom they share the "special library" designation as part of the present study: 76% of government library administrators have been formally educated in librarianship; 66% have a humanities background; 39% belong to the American Library Association; and 73% call themselves "Librarian." Substantial age differences emerge as well. Only 38% of the industrial library administrators are over fifty years of age, while 70% of governmental librarians are. Variations in personal characteristics were not found as clearly related to differences in change orientation however. It cannot be said that being drawn from other than librarianship or having a preference for functioning in an industrial library environment means that the individual will be a more change-oriented administrator. He is not necessarily an aggressive manager and may be quite accepting of the traditional library philosophy.

Certain variations in practice and in attitudes toward change from other types of library administrators were discernible, however. Many of these administrators are clearly in the vanguard insofar as applications of computers and advanced technology to library purposes. Instead of the concentration on physical plant and collection development so evident in the other library situations, the change phenomena in the special library tend to cluster around implementation of the new technology. These tend to take the shape of client-oriented computer applications, advances in the use and application of micro-reproduction and participation the more sophisticated network designs. There is a greater propensity to focus upon client requirements and satisfactions as the basic measure of the library contribution. And there is a significantly greater preoccupation with subject expertise.

And yet this administrative class presents no model of active, impatient, leadership committed to a reconstitution of library and information services. Just as his peer groups in other library forms, the administrator of the special library or information center may express dissatisfaction with the existing order and even a disposition toward alternatives, yet such views do not constitute a firm commitment to change. Self-criticism is not a reliable predictor of a striving to transcend traditional library forms. The evidence of this study revealed no urgency to shift from prevailing practice, to reassess and to reshape the basic philosophy of the field in order to influence change in the nature of the services, in clientele priorities, or in service orientation. The external pressures upon the special librarian appear to be moderate.

But rather than engendering anxiety or apprehension, the effect of general organizational indifference to the library seems more nearly to elicit complacency. For the special library administrator is predominantly a local functionary, highly sensitive to the organizational bureaucracy within which his library operates, but subject to very little in the way of national professional pressures and strains. Organizational apathy to the library is thus scarcely seen as a mandate to conjure a new strategy for adapting library programs and purpose. An organizational culture not habituated to expect more than it gets from the library does not inspire a role of change agent in its library administrator, who by his very temperament and value commitments admirably qualifies as a typical bureaucratic functionary.

Despite the special library field's more progressive service philosophy, then, revolutionary change in information practices does not seem to constitute a driving thrust of the special library movement. Rather it is likely that in both the industrial and governmental settings, new types of information units will continue to be spawned wherever the conventional library fails to broaden its mandate so as to enlarge the scope of its activity to encompass advanced information services. Except for the isolated administrator of the special library or information center, the disposition to move dramatically toward such change is now uncommon. The precondition for the more pervasive assumption of such a role among special library administrators is unlikely to obtain until the organizations within which special libraries are lodged begin themselves to perceive the need to coordinate, to consolidate, and to rationalize such information services within one viable unit. Without such impetus, the same lethargy which inhibits the reconstitution of other forms of library organization seems highly likely to continue to constrain significant change in special libraries or information centers as well.

SAMPLE DESIGN AND SAMPLE RETURNS

The initial source used for definition of the special libraries' universe was: Kruzas, Anthony T. (ed.) Directory of Special Libraries and Information Centers, 2nd ed. (Detroit, Gale, 1968). Facilities were marked for selection on the basis of two criteria:

To be included: those reporting staff of ten persons or more (not included if no staff number reported)*

To be excluded: all public libraries and libraries associated with teaching institutions

Two exceptions to the first criterion were made: Both the Newberry Library and the Department of Commerce Library were included in the universe--given their size and importance--although neither indicated their staff complements in the Directory.

With respect to the second criterion, all facilities operated by or within institutions containing the word "school" in their official titles were automatically excluded as "teaching institutions." No further check was made to determine the character of the school in question. In addition, the large number of Army Base Libraries (and similar operations in other branches of the military) were excluded as being essentially public library facilities.

To supplement the 394 special libraries chosen in the manner described above, 10 Department of Defense Information Analysis Centers were included. These were taken from Appendix 11 of the Kruzas Directory, and were chosen by Mr. Herbert S. White, former President of the Special Libraries Association, as being sufficiently large.

Mr. White also suggested the inclusion of 23 institutions listed in 1968-69 Handbook and Directory of the American Society for Information Science (ASIS). The names of the 23 administrators were provided by Mr. White, each being the head of a special library or information center of sufficient size.

---

* It should be noted that these figures represent the personnel situation at the time of the Kruzas compilation; there has undoubtedly been some fluctuation in staff size since then.

ST 73

The inclusion of the above types of centers brought the universe up to 427 institutions. Of these, 150 were chosen at random to be the sample. Of the 150 to whom questionnaires were sent, 95 completed and returned them, for a response rate of 64%. These 95 will be referred to below as the final returns.

To determine whether the final returns gave an accurate picture of the size distribution of the special libraries, Table 39 was prepared. Here the universe and the final returns are compared by the size of their staff complements. It is evident that there is no significant difference between the two distributions.

TABLE 39

COMPARISON OF UNIVERSE AND FINAL RETURNS
BY SIZE OF STAFF COMPLEMENTS

No. of Staff Members	Universe	Final Returns
10-15	47%	46%
16-20	16	18
21-30	16	12
31-50	12	14
51-100	6	6
Over 100	3	4

Since the special libraries form such a highly disparate group, it was also decided to compare the universe and final returns by type of library and by the type of organization of which each library is a part. Table 40 gives a comparison according to the subject matter of the libraries, and Table 41 according to type of organization. Clearly, no significant distortion is present in the final returns.

TABLE 40

COMPARISON OF UNIVERSE AND FINAL RETURNS
BY TYPE OF LIBRARY SUBJECT MATTER

Type	Universe	Final Returns
Humanities	14%	11%
Social Sciences	6	5
Science	24	24
Engineering	28	28
Medical	5	5
Business	4	4
Law	3	4
Publishing	6	5
State library	9	12
Other	2	2

TABLE 41

COMPARISON OF UNIVERSE AND FINAL RETURNS
BY TYPE OF ORGANIZATION

Type	Universe	Final Returns
Company	35%	37%
Government (includes military)	39	32
State library	9	12
Other (professional societies, nonprofit organizations, etc.)	17	20

As a final check on any bias that may have been introduced, the final returns were compared with the universe on the basis of sex and geographical region. These comparisons are shown in Tables 42 and 43. No significant differences were found.

TABLE 42

COMPARISON OF UNIVERSE AND FINAL RETURNS BY SEX

Sex	Universe	Final Returns
Male	63%	64%
Female	37	36

TABLE 43

COMPARISON OF UNIVERSE AND FINAL RETURNS BY CENSUS REGION

Census Region	Universe	Final Returns
New England	6%	3%
Middle Atlantic	24	20
South Atlantic	24	23
East North Central	16	18
East South Central	3	4
West North Central	5	5
West South Central	3	2
Mountain	5	4
Pacific	15	20

SUPPLEMENTAL TABLES

BACKGROUND AND CAREER OF ADMINISTRATORS OF SPECIAL LIBRARIES OR INFORMATION CENTERS

TABLE 44

SEX

	Percent
Male	60
Female	40

TABLE 45

MARITAL STATUS

	Percent
Single	21
Married	70
Widowed	5
Divorced or separated	4

TABLE 46

OCCUPATION OF WIFE*

	Percent**
Housewife	54
Professional, technical and kindred workers	21
Librarian	13
Clerical and kindred workers	10
Managers, officials and proprietors, (except farm)	2

*Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census. 1960 Census of Population. Alphabetical Index of Occupations & Industries (Revised Edition)

**Base = those who responded to this question

7705

TABLE 47

WIFE WORKING AT PRESENT TIME

	Percent*
Yes	35
No	65

*Base = those who responded to this question

TABLE 48

PLACE OF BIRTH

	Percent
U. S. Census Region*	
New England	7
Middle Atlantic	17
East North Central	23
West North Central	14
South Atlantic	8
East South Central	6
West South Central	5
Mountain	6
Pacific	5
Canada	1
Outside U. S. and Canada	4
No response	2

*Source for census categories: U. S. Bureau of the Census. 1960 Census of Population. Vol. 1. Characteristics of the Population. Part A. Number of Inhabitants.

TABLE 49

PLACE MOST HIGH SCHOOL YEARS SPENT

	Percent
U. S. Census Region	
New England	5
Middle Atlantic	21
East North Central	21
West North Central	13
South Atlantic	8
East South Central	4
West South Central	4
Mountain	2
Pacific	11
Canada	1
Outside U.S. and Canada	4
No response	5

TABLE 50

FATHER'S OCCUPATION
PROFESSIONAL, TECHNICAL AND KINDRED WORKERS ONLY

	Percent*
Scientists, doctors, engineers	41
Lawyers	9
Accountants	9
Newspaper editors, correspondents	9
Architects	9
School principals, superintendents	5
College and university professors	5
Teachers (elementary and secondary)	5
Librarians	5
Other	5

*Base = the number in the category "Professional, technical and kindred workers"

TABLE 51

FATHER'S OCCUPATION:
MANAGERS, OFFICIALS AND PROPRIETORS (EXCEPT FARM) ONLY

	Percent*
Corporation executives, managers	48
Small business owners, merchants	33
Government officials	10
Bankers	5
Labor union officials	5

*Base = the number in the category "Managers, officials and proprietors (except farm)"

TABLE 52

FATHER'S EDUCATION

	Percent
Eighth grade or less	32
High School	38
College	26
No response	4

TABLE 53

MOTHER'S EDUCATION

	Percent
Eighth grade or less	25
High school	53
College	18
No response	4

TABLE 54

CONTROL OF INSTITUTION FROM WHICH FIRST COLLEGE DEGREE WAS RECEIVED*

	Percent
Public	46
Private	40
Could not be determined	3
No response	11

*Source: Cass, James and Birnbaum, Max. Comparative Guide to American Colleges, Harper and Row. New York, 1968-69.

TABLE 55

TYPE OF INSTITUTION FROM WHICH FIRST COLLEGE DEGREE WAS RECEIVED*

	Percent
University	60
Liberal Arts College	24
Independently organized professional school	4
Could not be determined	1
No response	11

*Source: Cass, James and Birnbaum, Max. Comparative Guide to American Colleges, Harper and Row. New York, 1968-69.

TABLE 56

PROXIMITY OF FIRST COLLEGE DEGREE INSTITUTION TO PLACE OF HIGH SCHOOL YEARS

	Percent
Same census region	75
Different census region	12
Could not be determined	3
No response	11

TABLE 57

YEAR FIRST COLLEGE DEGREE
WAS RECEIVED

	Percent
1925 - 1929	4
1930 - 1934	8
1935 - 1939	26
1940 - 1944	13
1945 - 1949	11
1950 - 1954	11
1955 - 1959	10
1960 or later	3
No response	14

TABLE 58

RESPONSE TO: "DO YOU HAVE FORMAL
EDUCATION IN LIBRARY SCIENCE?"

	Percent
Yes	61
No	39

TABLE 59

YEAR FORMAL LIBRARY EDUCATION WAS COMPLETED

	Percent*
1930 - 1934	13
1935 - 1939	7
1940 - 1944	21
1945 - 1949	9
1950 - 1954	20
1955 - 1959	9
1960 - 1964	5
1965 or later	16

*Base = those who responded to this question

TABLE 60

RESPONSE TO: "DO YOU HAVE FORMAL EDUCATION BEYOND THE BACHELOR'S IN ANOTHER FIELD?"

	Percent
Yes	42
No	54
No response	4

838

TABLE 61

RESPONSE TO: "WHAT TYPE OF LIBRARIAN OR INFORMATION PERSON DID YOU EXPECT TO BE ORIGINALLY?"

	Percent
Specified by Type of Library	53
Special	25
Public	14
School	7
Academic	6
Other	1
Specified by Type of Work	30
Reference	11
Administrative	10
Technical services	5
Clientele services	2
Other	2
Did not know	3
No response	18

TABLE 62

RESPONSE TO: "IF YOU ATTENDED A FORMAL PROGRAM IN LIBRARIANSHIP OR INFORMATION SCIENCE, DID YOUR INTERESTS CHANGE IN ANY WAY DURING YOUR EDUCATION?"

	Percent*
Yes	17
No	83

*Base = those who responded to this question

TABLE 63

RESPONSE TO: "HAVE YOU EVER SERIOUSLY CONSIDERED GETTING OUT OF LIBRARY OR INFORMATION CENTER ADMINISTRATION ALTOGETHER?"

	Percent
Yes	35
No	63
No response	1

TABLE 64

RESPONSE TO: "IF YOU COULD DO THINGS OVER, DO YOU THINK YOU WOULD CHOOSE LIBRARY OR INFORMATION CENTER WORK AGAIN?"

	Percent
Yes	75
No	19
Did not know	2
No response	4

PROFESSIONAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE ISSUES

TABLE 65

RESPONSE TO: "THIS PART CONSISTS OF STATEMENTS WHICH HAVE BEEN MADE IN THE LIBRARY LITERATURE AND ELSEWHERE. PLEASE GIVE US YOUR GENERAL REACTION TO THEM BY INDICATING WHETHER YOU TEND TO AGREE OR DISAGREE."

	Percent				
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral or Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. Despite other factors, advancement in most libraries still depends largely on ability.	23	52	14	6	3
2. There is not much the average reference librarian does which could not be done by an intelligent college graduate after a minimum period of in-service training.	8	39	8	30	14
3. The computer offers some but no major advantages for the special library and information center.	1	20	13	42	20
4. Getting ahead in this profession depends on knowing the right people.	3	22	22	39	11
5. We must look increasingly to federal support to make major improvements in information science and library technology.	7	39	16	32	3
6. Librarians in general are far too timid and passive.	20	42	16	20	1
7. Those advocating change in the profession are frequently more concerned with their own advancement than with helping the profession.	7	12	31	44	4

Table 65 (cont.)

	Percent				
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral or Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
8. If special libraries don't "get with it" others within the organization they serve will come along to do their job.	23	53	7	13	0
9. Knowledge of the collection is more important than knowledge of the user.	4	18	14	45	14
10. The leadership in this profession is by and large conservative and largely concerned with protecting the status quo.	16	28	22	27	2
11. Reducing processing backlogs is more important than insisting on accuracy.	10	25	19	33	12
12. Little can be done to effect major change in libraries until those who control the funds are educated as to the value of the library.	34	41	14	8	1
13. Space problems in special libraries and information centers will only be solved by greater use of microstorage devices.	8	38	19	28	1
14. Those coming into the profession ought to be prepared to learn before they suggest changes.	19	47	10	19	2
15. Centralization is the best way to organize collections and services for scattered users in the same organization.	14	31	23	27	2
16. Libraries have simply failed to respond to changing times and changing needs.	8	30	15	39	3
17. We will be remembered not for the service we gave but for the collections we leave behind us.	0	22	18	46	11

Table 65 (cont.)

	Percent				
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral or Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
18. While it is true libraries need to change, change is well underway and will come about naturally.	0	23	21	46	2
19. Major improvements in local library and information service can be expected from increased interlibrary cooperation.	12	53	16	14	0
20. Users need to be helped to help themselves.	18	67	5	5	2
21. There is probably not much the average library or information administrator can do to effect change much one way or another.	2	1	3	54	37
22. Librarians have accepted low salaries far too long.	24	33	26	11	1
23. Users frequently demand services they should be doing themselves.	11	41	12	33	2
24. A technician level is needed in libraries and information centers to relieve the time of the professional.	31	56	10	2	0
25. While reaching unserved elements is desirable, most libraries and information centers have all they can do to keep up with their present users.	7	40	21	27	1
26. The technology of data processing and micro-reprography is not yet sufficiently developed to warrant widespread implementation in libraries and information centers.	4	24	13	46	12
27. Serving the personal or non-work related interests of people is not a legitimate function of the special library or information center.	10	37	15	32	5

TABLE 66

MAJOR CHANGES IN RESPONDENTS' LIBRARIES FROM 1965 to 1969

	Percent
Introduction or increased use of microforms	62
Introduction or further use of data processing equipment	54
Substantial salary increases	47
Upgrading of positions	47
New quarters (or considerable expansion or remodeling of existing quarters)	46
New or greatly expanded service to users (reference and bibliographic service, translation services, etc.)	43
Major change in procedures for processing materials (ordering, cataloging)	43
Other changes affecting your collection and materials (such as substantial increase in special types of materials)	41
A major change in policies or practices regarding the scope of your collection	38
Reorganization of departments or change in the administrative structure within the library or information center	34
An extraordinary increase in the money available for materials	33
Substantial increase in staff	33
Major change in circulation or other procedures including lending regulations	32
Addition of new types of personnel (such as subject specialists, systems analysts, etc.)	30
The introduction or expansion of other specialized user services	30
New or greatly expanded user facilities (such as telefacsimile, messenger service)	26
Major improvements in interlibrary loan or other access to outside collections	26
Establishment of new service outlets outside the main library	26
Reclassification of your collection	25
Recent changes in hierarchy through which your library or information center reports	22
Other changes	17
No response	6

INSTITUTIONAL DATA

TABLE 67

LOCATION OF INSTITUTION

	Percent
New England	3
Middle Atlantic	20
East North Central	18
West North Central	5
South Atlantic	23
East South Central	4
West South Central	2
Mountain	4
Pacific	20

TABLE 68

PROXIMITY OF INSTITUTION TO PLACE
RESPONDENT SPENT HIGH SCHOOL YEARS

	Percent
Same census region	36
Different census region	64

9010

TABLE 69

RESPONSE TO: "DOES YOUR LIBRARY OR INFORMATION CENTER HAVE A GENERAL ANNOUNCING SERVICE (SUCH AS AN ACQUISITIONS BULLETIN)?"

	Percent
Yes	76
No	24

TABLE 70

RESPONSE TO: "DO YOU HAVE AN INDIVIDUALIZED ANNOUNCING SERVICE, SUCH AS S.D.I.?"

	Percent
Yes	35
No	62
No response	3

TABLE 71

RESPONSE TO: "DO YOU HAVE BRANCHES OR SEPARATELY ADMINISTERED COLLECTIONS?"

	Percent
Yes	51
No	46
No response	3

9100

TABLE 72

RESPONSE TO: "DO ANY OF YOUR STAFF HAVE A MASTER'S DEGREE IN A SUBJECT FIELD?"

	Percent
Yes	64
No	34
No response	2

TABLE 73

RESPONSE TO: "ARE THERE ARRANGEMENTS FOR LEAVES OF ABSENCE FOR STUDY PURPOSES FOR YOUR STAFF MEMBERS?"

	Percent
Yes	60
No	38
No response	2

TABLE 74

RESPONSE TO: "IF YES, (THERE ARE ARRANGEMENTS FOR LEAVES OF ABSENCE FOR STUDY PURPOSES) IS THERE PARTIAL OR FULL FINANCIAL SUPPORT FROM YOUR ORGANIZATION?"

	Percent*
Yes	74
No	26

*Base = those who responded to this question

TABLE 75

RESPONSE TO: "HOW MANY STAFF MEMBERS HAVE TAKEN ADVANTAGE OF SUCH OPPORTUNITY (ARRANGEMENTS FOR LEAVES OF ABSENCE FOR STUDY PURPOSES) IN THE LAST THREE YEARS?"

	Percent*
One or more staff members took leaves of absence	73
No staff members took leaves of absence	27

*Base = those who responded to this questi

TABLE 76

RESPONSE TO: "TO WHOM DO YOU REPORT?"

	Percent
Chief executive officer or policy making body	34
Vice President	11
Manager of department or division	42
Other (e.g., executive editor, assistant to chief executive officer)	8
No response	5

TABLE 77

RESPONSE TO: "IS THERE A LIBRARY COMMITTEE?"

	Percent
Yes	26
No	64
No response	10

TABLE 78

RESPONSE TO: "IF YES, HOW IS IT (LIBRARY COMMITTEE) SELECTED?"

	Percent*
Appointed by an administrator	63
Selected by the manager of the library or information center	17
Selected by the client group	13
Selected by departments or groups	8

*Base = those who responded to this question

TABLE 79

RESPONSE TO: "IS YOUR LIBRARY OR INFORMATION CENTER A MEMBER OR PARTICIPANT IN ANY REGIONAL OR NATIONAL COOPERATIVE LIBRARY PROGRAMS? (INCLUDE SUCH PROGRAMS AS MARC, RECEIPT OF MAGNETIC TAPES FROM GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES, SOCIETIES, ETC.)"

	Percent
Yes	35
No	53
No response	13

TABLE 80

RESPONDENTS' REPORT OF REGIONAL OR NATIONAL COOPERATIVE PROGRAMS IN WHICH THEIR LIBRARIES OR INFORMATION CENTERS ARE MEMBERS

	Percent*
Local	30
State	18
Inter-state	18
National	61

*Base = those who responded to this question

TABLE 81

RESPONSE TO: "IS THIS (DESCRIPTION OF DECISION MAKING SITUATION) THE WAY YOU PREFER IT TO BE?"

	Percent
Yes	84
No	3
No response	14

TABLE 82

RESPONSE TO: "IN VIEW OF YOUR SITUATION, DO YOU FIND THESE DEMANDS:"

	Percent
Reasonable	80
Unreasonable	3
Some reasonable, some unreasonable	3
No response	14

SPECIAL COMPARATIVE ANALYSES

TABLE 83

COMPARISON OF RESPONDENTS WITH FORMAL LIBRARY EDUCATION TO RESPONDENTS WITHOUT FORMAL LIBRARY EDUCATION

	61% WITH Formal Library Education	39% WITHOUT Formal Library Education
	Percent	Percent
A. SEX		
Male	50	76
Female	50	24
B. AGE		
Under 35	3	3
35 - 50	22	62
Over 50	62	30
No response	12	5
C. UNDERGRADUATE SUBJECT MAJOR		
Humanities (including history)	48	24
Social Sciences	26	19
Sciences	14	29
Applied Fields (e.g., business, education, engineering)	7	19
Library Science	3	0
No response	2	8

096

TABLE 84

COMPARISON OF RESPONDENT MEMBERS OF AMERICAN SOCIETY FOR INFORMATION SCIENCE TO NON-MEMBERS

	35% MEMBERS	60% NON-MEMBERS
	Percent	Percent
A. SEX		
Male	64	56
Female	36	44
B. AGE		
Under 35	3	4
35 - 50	40	37
Over 50	46	53
No response	12	7
C. UNDERGRADUATE SUBJECT MAJOR		
Humanities (including history)	21	50
Social Sciences	24	23
Sciences	33	10
Applied Fields (e.g., business, education, engineering)	21	7
Library Science	0	4
No response	1	6

0697

TABLE 85

COMPARISON OF RESPONDENT MEMBERS OF AMERICAN LIBRARY ASSOCIATION TO NON-MEMBERS

	34% MEMBERS	61% NON-MEMBERS
A. SEX	Percent	Percent
Male	56	60
Female	44	40
B. AGE		
Under 35	3	3
35 - 50	22	47
Over 50	63	43
No response	13	7
C. UNDERGRADUATE SUBJECT MAJOR		
Humanities (including history)	50	33
Social Sciences	31	19
Sciences	0	29
Applied Fields (e.g., business, education, engineering)	6	15
Library Science	6	0
No response	6	3

TABLE 86

COMPARISON OF RESPONSES TO: "IF YOU WERE ASKED IN SOME FORMAL PLACE, SUCH AS IN A PASSPORT APPLICATION TO NAME YOUR OCCUPATION, WHAT WOULD YOU GIVE?"

	63% Called Themselves "Librarians"	31% Used Other Title
	Percent	Percent
A. SEX		
Male	51	77
Female	49	23
B. AGE		
Under 35	2	7
35 - 50	32	52
Over 50	56	36
No response	11	7
C. UNDERGRADUATE SUBJECT MAJOR		
Humanities (including history)	46	26
Social Sciences	22	23
Sciences	17	26
Applied Fields (e.g., business, education, engineering)	7	22
Library Science	3	0
No response	5	3

99 60

TABLE 87

COMPARISON OF RESPONDENTS IN GOVERNMENTAL, INDUSTRIAL, AND "OTHER" SPECIAL LIBRARIES AND INFORMATION CENTERS

	35% GOVERNMENT	36% COMPANY	27% OTHER
	Percent		
A. SEX			
Male	61	59	58
Female	39	41	42
B. AGE			
Under 35	0	0	12
35 - 50	21	56	39
Over 50	70	38	39
No response	9	6	12
C. UNDERGRADUATE SUBJECT MAJOR			
Humanities (including history)	66	32	27
Social Sciences	21	27	19
Sciences	6	24	34
Applied Fields (e.g., business, education, engineering)	3	18	15
Library Science	6	0	0
No response	0	9	4

Manpower Study
Confidential Report

ADMINISTRATORS QUESTIONNAIRE

(Special Library and Information Center Section)

This questionnaire is designed to achieve two central objectives: to learn something about library and information center administrators and to gain information about their operations and the changes taking place in them.

It is divided into four main sections: I. The Background, Careers and Professional Activity of Administrators. II. Administrative and Professional Issues. III. Library and Information Center Change Report. IV. Institutional Data.

Please be frank. We want to know how administrators in this field feel about the many issues which surround library and information center development. If the space provided is not adequate, use the back of pages. Please do not feel, however, that you need to have an opinion or answer in every case. For some questions, for example, you may wish to write "Haven't thought about it," "No idea," "No opinion," or "Not sure."

Thank you in advance for cooperating with this study.

I. Background and Career

This section asks about your background, education and work experience. Answers to these questions will permit us to compare library and information center administrators with other administrative groups such as business and federal executives.

1. Sex:
   1. _____male
   2. _____female

2. Present age: _____

3. Marital status:
   1. _____single
   2. _____married
   3. _____widowed
   4. _____divorced or separated

4. Number of children: _____

5. Occupation of your wife (husband): _____

6. Is she (he) working at the present time:
   1. _____yes
   2. _____no

7. Your place of birth (give state if U.S., name of country if other than U.S.):

   _____

8. Place you spent most of your high school years: _____

9. Father's occupation: _____

10. Father's education:
    1. _____eighth grade or less
    2. _____high school
    3. _____college

11. Mother's education:
    1. _____eighth grade or less
    2. _____high school
    3. _____college

12. Your undergraduate subject major: _____

13. Name of institution from which first college degree was received:

    _____

14. Year degree was received: _____

15. Do you have formal education in library science?
    1. _____yes
    2. _____no

16. If yes, please give the nature of your library education:
    1. _____undergraduate minor in library science
    2. _____fifth year bachelor's in library science
    3. _____master's degree in library science
    4. _____Ph.D. in library science
    5. _____other (please give): _____

17. Please give the name of the school or schools where your library science education was received: _____

18. Year you completed your formal library education: _____

19. Do you have formal education beyond the bachelor's in another field?
    1. _____yes
    2. _____no

20. If yes, please give the nature of your advanced work:
    1. _____additional hours in (give field of study): _____
    2. _____master's degree in (give field of study): _____
    3. _____Ph.D. in (give field of study): _____
    4. _____other: _____

21. Since graduation from college, please summarize the non-library and non-information center work experience you have had (include military experience):

Type of Work (such as high school teaching)	Number of Years

22. Please give each full-time library or information center position held. Arrange in chronological order:

Name of Position	Institution	Number of Years

(Use other side of page if necessary.)

23. When did you definitely decide to become a librarian or information scientist? What were you doing at the time:
    1. _____while working as an undergraduate in the college library
    2. _____after graduation from college, while working in a library
    3. _____while engaged in another career
    4. _____other (please give): _____

24. As you recall, what factors entered into your choice:
    1. _____A member of my family was a librarian.
    2. _____I was influenced by a librarian I knew.
    3. _____I always liked books.
    4. _____As a result of vocational counseling.
    5. _____From working in a subject discipline, I recognized the importance of information handling.
    6. _____I had reached a dead end in my technical field and information work opened new avenues.
    7. _____Other factors (please give): _____

25. What type of librarian or information person did you expect to be originally?

    _____

26. If you attended a formal program in librarianship or information science, did your interests change in any way during your education?
    1. _____yes
    2. _____no

27. If yes, please explain in what way: _____

    _____

28. At what point did you decide to go into library or information center administration?
    1. _____from the beginning
    2. _____during library school
    3. _____after some time as a librarian or information worker
    4. _____I never consciously decided. It just happened.
    5. _____other (please give): _____

    _____

29. Has any one person or circumstance more than others influenced the direction of your career? (Please explain.)

    _____

    _____

30. Have you ever <u>seriously</u> considered getting out of library or information center administration altogether?
    1. _____yes
    2. _____no

31. If yes, what for?
    1. _____going back to being a librarian or information worker
    2. _____going into library school teaching
    3. _____starting a new career in: _____
    4. _____returning to the discipline of your subject preparation
    5. _____going upward in the administrative world outside of library and information center work
    6. _____other alternatives which have been considered:

    _____

32. If you could do things over, do you think you would choose library or information center work again?
    1. _____yes
    2. _____no

33. If no, please tell what field you would choose instead and briefly, why:

    _____

    _____

34. If you were asked in some formal place, such as in a passport application, to name your occupation, what would you give? _____

35. How long have you held your present position? _____

36. Which of the following best describes how you feel about making a job change in the near future?
    1. _____I have only recently taken this position and therefore do not anticipate a move in the near future.
    2. _____I am pretty well settled where I am. I do not anticipate a change.
    3. _____I am actively interested in making a job change.
    4. _____While I am not actively seeking a change, I am interested in openings which occur and would certainly be prepared to change jobs if the right opportunity came along.

37. In contemplating making a job move, what factors would enter into your decision? (If you do <u>not</u> intend to move, what factors enter into your staying where you are?)

    _____

    _____

    _____

38. <u>Ideally</u>, what would you like to be doing five years from now?

    _____

    _____

39. What do you see as the most important things you should do in your present role?

40. What have you found to be the main satisfactions and rewards of your present role?

41. What have you found to be the main dissatisfactions and frustrations?

42. Please tell us about the professional organizations to which you belong (information oriented and others) and about the nature of your participation.

Name of Organization	No. of Years A Member	Nature of Your Participation (Please Check)		
		Attend Meetings	Committee Member Presently	Officer in the last 5 years

43. Other activities of a professional nature outside your own organization in the last three years: (Please check.)
1. _____active in regional planning efforts
2. _____contributed to the literature
3. _____conducted surveys or studies of other libraries or information facilities
4. _____other professional activities (please describe): _____

44. How would you rate the following as sources of professional ideas and stimulation for you? (Please number in order of importance. No. 1, most important, etc.)

1. _____professionals on your staff
2. _____other information professionals
3. _____meetings of professional information groups
4. _____special institutes and conferences
5. _____people outside the information field (please indicate the type of people):

_____

_____

6. _____professional journals and other literature of librarianship and information science
7. _____literature outside librarianship and information science (identify field):

_____

_____

45. Are there people you consider to be the following? (You need not know the persons you name.)

1. Most influential in advancing the field:

Person (please explain who they are)	Reason for your choice
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

2. Contributing important new ideas to the field:

Person (please explain who they are)	Reason for your choice
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

3. The most effective administrators in the field (not necessarily the most successful):

Person (please explain who they are)	Reason for your choice
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

II. Professional and Administrative Issues

This section is designed to find out how library and information center administrators feel about a number of issues. The first part consists of statements which have been made in the library literature and elsewhere. Please give us your general reaction to them by indicating whether you tend to agree or disagree.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral or Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. Despite other factors, advancement in most libraries still depends largely on ability.					
2. There is not much the average reference librarian does which could not be done by an intelligent college graduate after a minimum period of in-service training.					
3. The computer offers some but no major advantages for the special library and information center.					
4. Getting ahead in this profession depends on knowing the right people.					
5. We must look increasingly to federal support to make major improvements in information service and library technology.					
6. Librarians in general are far too timid and passive.					
7. Those advocating change in the profession are frequently more concerned with their own advancement than with helping the profession.					
8. If special libraries d't "get with it", others w..h-in the organization they serve will come along to do their job.					
9. Knowledge of the collection is more important than knowledge of the user.					
10. The leadership in this profession is by and large conservative and largely concerned with protecting the status quo.					
11. Reducing processing backlogs is more important than insisting on accuracy.					
12. Little can be done to effect major change in libraries until those who control the funds are educated as to the value of the library.					

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral or Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
13. Space problems in special libraries and information centers will only be solved by greater use of microstorage devices.					
14. Those coming into the profession ought to be prepared to learn before they suggest changes.					
15. Centralization is the best way to organize collections and services for scattered users in the same organization.					
16. Libraries have simply failed to respond to changing times and changing needs.					
17. We will be remembered not for the service we gave but for the collections we leave behind us.					
18. While it is true libraries need to change, change is well underway and will come about naturally.					
19. Major improvements in local library and information service can be expected from increased inter-library cooperation.					
20. Users need to be helped to help themselves.					
21. There is probably not much the average library or information administrator can do to effect change much one way or another.					
22. Librarians have accepted low salaries far too long.					
23. Users frequently demand services they should be doing themselves.					
24. A technician level is needed in libraries and information centers to relieve the time of the professional.					
25. While reaching unserved elements is desirable, most libraries and information centers have all they can do to keep up with their present users.					
26. The technology of data processing and microreprography is not yet sufficiently developed to warrant widespread implementation in libraries and information centers.					
27. Serving the personal or non-work related interests of people is not a legitimate function of the special library or information center.					

The questions which follow are designed to obtain in more detail your views on issues related to the future of libraries and information centers.

28. There are many who believe that the information revolution (the introduction of computerized storage and retrieval of information) is going to have a radical impact on the special library and information center. What do you foresee will come about?

29. Library schools have come in for criticism regarding whether they are meeting the real needs and problems of the field. What is your assessment?

30. In recent months there has been open criticism of the leadership role of the professional associations. Please give us any comments you care to make on this issue, including your views on whether present associations represent your needs and interests.

31. There has been some recent establishment of information centers to supplement existing libraries. Some people feel that this restricts the library to what is almost a custodial function. What are your feelings?

32. Some people we have talked to feel that something needs to be done to change the types of people being attracted into librarianship. What is your assessment?

33. Special library and information service is frequently of such a nature that both preparation in librarianship and in a specific subject discipline are desirable. If the combination background is unobtainable which do you feel is more important for the successful operation of the service?

34. Within management structures, libraries and information centers are most frequently placed in either the administrative or research hierarchy. Which do you consider preferable and to what extent do you consider it a significant factor in achieving your goals?

35. Charges have been made that by and large the special library and information center is failing to meet the needs of its user community. Please give us your estimate.

36. Many people feel the future direction of library and information service lies in the development of regional and national library and information networks. How much do you feel such developments should influence the individual program of the special library and information center in the next 5-10 years?

37. In attempting to effect change in most special library and information center situations, which of the following are called for? (Put a V beside any statements you feel are very advisable; put an N beside those you feel are not appropriate.)

1. _____recognition that lasting change is not made overnight
2. _____adopt a forceful, aggressive approach to effecting change
3. _____seize on opportunities as they arise; "strike while the iron is hot"
4. _____willingness to see the library's needs for support in relation to other needs of the organization
5. _____readiness to leave if requests are not met in a reasonable time
6. _____finesse in getting changes accepted by administrations
7. _____willingness to take temporary defeat without giving up ultimate objectives
8. _____maintaining sound relationships with influential people and groups within the organization by keeping them satisfied
9. _____conducting a careful and methodical program of introducing new developments using caution and restraint
10. _____choosing dramatic innovations as the way to enhance the climate for change acceptance.

III. Library and Information Center Change Report

We are interested in learning of the major changes occurring in libraries and information centers. Please tell us what changes have been made or are taking place in your operation over the last four years (1965 to date). Space has been provided for you to describe the nature of the change. Please be as specific as possible--from what to what.

1. _____An extraordinary increase in the money available for materials.

2. _____A major change in policies or practices regarding the scope of your collection.

3. _____Introduction or increased use of microforms.

4. _____Other changes affecting your collection and materials. (Such as substantial increase in special types of materials.)

5. _____Introduction or further use of data processing equipment.

6. _____Major change in procedures for processing materials. (Ordering, cataloging.)

7. _____Major change in circulation or other procedures including lending regulations.

8. _____Reclassification of your collection.

9. _____New quarters (or considerable expansion or remodeling of existing quarters).

10. _____New or greatly expanded user facilities (such as telefacsimile, messenger service).

11. _____New or greatly expanded service to users (reference and bibliographic service; translation services; etc.).

12. _____The introduction or expansion of other specialized user services (please name).

13. _____Major improvements in inter-library loan or other access to outside collections.

14. _____Reorganization of departments or change in the administrative structure within the library or information center.

15. _____Establishment of new service outlets outside the main library.

16. _____Addition of new types of personnel (such as subject specialists, systems analysts, etc.).

17. _____Substantial increase in staff.

18. _____Substantial salary increases.

19. _____Upgrading of positions.

20. _____Recent changes in hierarchy through which your library or information center reports. Please elaborate.

21. _____Other changes (please give).

_____

22. Identify what you see as the single most important of these recent changes and explain why you feel it is most important:

23. Check any of the following which describe the attitudes of your staff toward making changes:
    1. _____We have a number of staff members who are highly motivated to make change.
    2. _____Most of our staff would go along with changes if they were not too radical.
    3. _____We have a number of senior staff members who are opposed to change.
    4. _____We lack the expertise at present to make many needed changes.
    5. _____Other (please give):

    _____

    _____

24. How satisfied are you personally with the rate of change in your library?
    1. _____very satisfied
    2. _____reasonably satisfied
    3. _____not satisfied

25. What changes would you like to see happen in your situation in the short run?

26. In the long run, what changes would you like to see happen?

27. What are the prospects of realizing your aims? What stands in the way? Please explain your situation. Is your management aware of and does it support your objectives?

IV. Institutional Data

This section asks for information about your collections and services and about such other aspects as your user community. Please answer as freely as you can.

A. Background

1. Name of institution (optional): _____

2. Is your institution:
   1. _____governmental
   2. _____company
   3. _____scientific, technical or learned society
   4. _____other (please specify): _____

3. Please name the major activity of the institution you serve (i.e., banking, pharmaceuticals, military R & D, etc.): _____

4. Population served by your library or information center (give approximate number of people):
   1. Managerial staff: _____
   2. Professional and technical: _____
   3. Clerical and support: _____
   4. Clients of your organization: _____
   5. Other: _____

5. Please give the number of off-site locations served: _____

6. Library or information center budget:

	1964-65	1967-68
1. Salaries:	_____	_____
2. Materials:	_____	_____
3. Purchased services and equipment rental:	_____	_____
4. Other:	_____	_____
5. Total budget:	_____	_____

7. In addition, do you handle purchasing for other departments with funds allocated for that purpose?
   1. _____yes
   2. _____no

8. If yes, please give estimated dollar amount for 1967-68: $_____

9. Your estimate of the number of items not yet released for use awaiting processing: _____items.

10. What do you estimate the average time delay between receipt of material and its availability for use is? _____

B. Special Services

11. What is your policy or practice with regard to doing reference and bibliographic work?
    1. _____Ready reference service is given.
    2. _____Users are given assistance in getting started on library research.
    3. _____We do some literature searching on demand but do not volunteer the service.
    4. _____Other: _____

12. Does your library offer specialized materials:
    1. _____reports
    2. _____magnetic tapes
    3. _____clippings
    4. _____patents
    5. _____films
    6. _____slides
    7. _____engineering drawings
    8. _____other (please list): _____

13. Does your library or information center have a general announcing service (such as an acquisitions bulletin)?
    1. _____yes
    2. _____no

14. If yes, please describe: _____

15. Do you have an individualized announcing service, such as S.D.I.?
    1. _____yes
    2. _____no

16. If yes, please describe: _____

17. Other specialized user services you offer: _____

18. Do you have branches or separately administered collections?
    1. _____yes
    2. _____no

19. If yes, please describe: _____

C. Staff Section

20. Distribution of staff by type:
    1. No. of clerical staff (full-time equivalents): _____
    2. No. of technicians or sub-professional staff: _____
    3. No. of librarians: _____
    4. No. of other types of professionals (such as in subject disciplines, systems analysts, budget specialists): _____
    Please list them by position:

    _____

    _____

    _____

21. If you have technicians or sub-professionals on your staff, please give the capacities in which they work:

    _____

    _____

    _____

22. Do any of your staff have a master's degree in a subject field?
    1. _____yes
    2. _____no

23. If yes, give number:
    1. In the humanities (including history): _____
    2. In the social sciences: _____
    3. In science and engineering fields: _____

24. Please give the number of years the professional staff have been with the library:
    1. Less than one year: _____people
    2. One to three years: _____people
    3. Three to five years: _____people
    4. Five to ten years: _____people
    5. More than ten years: _____people

25. What is the sex distribution of your professional staff:
    1. No. of men: _____
    2. No. of women: _____

26. Please list the special institutes, conferences and other continuing education programs attended by members of your staff in the last twelve months (exclusive of professional association meetings): (Use other side of page if necessary.)

Conference or Institute	Number Attending

27. Are you or any of your staff currently engaged in any of the following: (Give number of people in each case.)
    1. Working toward a bachelor's degree: _____
    2. Working toward a master's degree in library science: _____
    3. Working toward a doctor's degree in library science: _____
    4. Working toward an advanced degree in another field: _____
    5. Taking individual courses: _____

28. Are there arrangements for leaves of absences for study purposes for your staff members?
    1. _____yes
    2. _____no

29. If yes, is there partial or full financial support from your organization?
    1. _____yes
    2. _____no

30. How many staff members have taken advantage of such opportunity in the last three years? _____

D. Organizational Relations

31. Please list the policy and advisory committees and groups within your organization of which you currently are a member:

    _____ _____ _____

    _____ _____ _____

32. Please list the committees and other groups to which members of your staff belong:

    _____ _____ _____

    _____ _____ _____

33. To whom do you report (position title of official): _____

34. About how many times have you talked with this official in the last twelve months? _____times.

35. Please tell us about these occasions; what did they have to do with?

36. How many times in the last twelve months have you talked with the chief executive officer of your organization (if not the official to whom you report)? _____times.

37. Please tell what these occasions had to do with:

38. What, if any, is the formally established procedure for written communication with your management (monthly reports, etc.). Please describe: _____

_____

_____

39. Is there a library committee?
    1. _____yes
    2. _____no

40. If yes, how is it selected?
    1. _____appointed by an administrator
    2. _____selected by departments or groups
    3. _____selected by the library or information center manager
    4. _____other ways (please give): _____

41. If there is a library committee, please give the nature of its activity last year:

E. Other Information

Automation:

42. Please give the library operations, if any, you have automated:
    1. _____serials
    2. _____ordering
    3. _____circulation
    4. _____retrieval
    5. _____dissemination
    6. _____publication
    7. _____other (please give): _____

43. What plans do you have for automation in the future? (Please give.)

_____

_____

_____

44. Have you made use of computerization to do any of the following yet?
    1. _____prepare a book catalog
    2. _____analyze your collection
    3. _____analyze use
    4. _____other analyses you have done: _____

_____

Inter-Library Cooperation:

45. Is your library or information center a member or participant in any regional or national cooperative library programs? (Include such programs as MARC, receipt of magnetic tapes from governmental agencies, societies, etc.)
    1. _____yes
    2. _____no

46. If yes, please name these programs: _____

_____

_____

47. What advantages presently accrue to you by virtue of this participation?
    1. _____adds to materials acquired by the library
    2. _____increased speed of inter-library loan
    3. _____arrangement for direct use by your clientele of other libraries
    4. _____information about material on a more comprehensive basis
    5. _____access to materials elsewhere not before readily available
    6. _____speed of access to cataloging information
    7. _____storage space for little used materials
    8. _____other advantages (please give): _____

48. What advantages do you hope to gain in the future from such participation?

_____

_____

_____

49. Do you presently employ outside commercial firms to do any of the following:
    1. _____handle book selection
    2. _____catalog card copying
    3. _____processing of books
    4. _____systems analysis or mechanization implementation
    5. _____other services: _____

_____

50. Do you have plans to make additional use of commercial firms in the future?
    1. _____yes
    2. _____no

51. If yes, please describe: _____

_____

Evaluation:

52. Does your library or information center regularly (continuously or at regular intervals and by plan or program) ascertain and analyze any of the following?

	Yes	No
1. The changing needs of the user population:	_____	_____
2. Proportion of the potential user population using the library or information center's services:	_____	_____
3. Characteristics of its users compared with the total population:	_____	_____
4. What users want:	_____	_____
5. Satisfaction of users:	_____	_____
6. Volume of use made of various services:	_____	_____
7. Work output of departments:	_____	_____
8. Collection weaknesses:	_____	_____
9. Proportion of filled to unfilled requests:	_____	_____
10. Volumes added to the collection:	_____	_____
11. Unit cost analysis:	_____	_____
12. Cost effectiveness studies:	_____	_____
13. Validation of continuing need for existing programs and services:	_____	_____
14. Other evaluation: Please give: _____	_____	_____

53. Have you had any special analyses done by your own staff or outsiders on these or other aspects of your program in the last three years? If yes, please tell about them:

_____

_____

_____

Planning:

54. Has your library made any special provision for planning or for the initiation and implementation of change? Please explain any special organization or strategies you have for handling change.

55. How would you characterize <u>your</u> part in planning and bringing about change?
    1. Do you initiate most of the ideas?
       _____yes
       _____no
    2. Do you have a major involvement in carrying out changes?
       _____yes
       _____no

56. Please explain your role:

Conflict:

57. Most staffs have some conflicts and differences. What do the major conflicts on your staff have to do with?
    1. _____personal differences among staff members
    2. _____conflict between departments
    3. _____conflict over the need for change or type of change
    4. _____conflict over the management of the library

58. Please explain the major differences among your staff (who differs with whom about what).

Administrative Relationships:

59. Which of the following best characterizes your organizational relationship with your supervisor:
    1. _____While I take into account the suggestions of my supervisor, I make the major decisions in this library.
    2. _____While my supervisor relies on me for advice, the final decisions rest with him.
    3. _____I make ongoing operational decisions while any policy change would be decided by my supervisor.
    4. _____All decisions regarding the library are made jointly based on discussion between my supervisor and myself.
    5. _____Policy changes affecting the library are frequently made by my supervisor without consulting me.

60. Which one of the following statements best characterizes the library or information center's internal situation?
    1. _____The professional staff make the major decisions in this library (or information center).
    2. _____The professional staff make the final decisions on some matters, while I do on others.
    3. _____While I rely on members of the staff for advice, the final decisions rest with me.
    4. _____The heads of departments make decisions in their own area. Any major change would be referred to me.
    5. _____I make all the major decisions in this library.

61. Is this the way you prefer it to be?
    1. _____yes
    2. _____no

62. Please comment on what you feel should be the nature and the extent of participation by your staff in decision-making:

External Pressure:

63. Following are listed kinds of demands which administrators of special libraries and information centers tell us are made upon their services by various user elements. Please indicate whether these or other pressures are being put on your facility nowadays:

Pressure for	Extent of Pressure: A great Deal	Some	Little or None	By (group(s) or element(s))
1. Longer hours of service:	_____	___	_____	_____
2. Increase in speed of processing materials:	_____	___	_____	_____
3. Improved inter-library loan:	_____	___	_____	_____
4. Establishment of branch libraries:	_____	___	_____	_____
5. Greater share of books for departmental retention:	_____	___	_____	_____
6. Greater say in the management of the library:	_____	___	_____	_____
7. Initiation of new or increased services, such as literature searches, retrieval, dissemination:	_____	___	_____	_____
8. More reference service:	_____	___	_____	_____
9. Better control over materials:	_____	___	_____	_____
10. More extensive copying services:	_____	___	_____	_____
11. Expansion to include additional kinds of materials:	_____	___	_____	_____
12. More liberal circulation policies:	_____	___	_____	_____
13. Other demands (please give):				
_____	_____	___	_____	_____
_____	_____	___	_____	_____
_____	_____	___	_____	_____
_____	_____	___	_____	_____

64. In view of your situation, do you find these demands:
    1. _____reasonable
    2. _____unreasonable

65. Please give us your assessment: